DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 382 405 PS 023 318

AUTHOR Rogers, Marilyn R.
TITLE Increasing Prevention of School Failure by Early Intervention for School Success of At-Risk Students Kindergarten through Grade Three.
REPORT NO TAC-B-437
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 182p.; Ed.D. Practicum Report, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; After School Programs; *High Risk Students; *Intervention; *Language Arts; Parent Participation; Parent Workshops; Practicums; *Primary Education; Program Effectiveness; Spanish Speaking; *Student Improvement
IDENTIFIERS Developmentally Appropriate Programs

ABSTRACT

A practicum project implemented a developmentally appropriate intervention to increase school success for at-risk children in kindergarten through grade 3. Two corollary aims of the project were to determine the causes of at-risk status before retention or school failure occurs, and to involve parents in their children's educational process. An extended-day early intervention program (after school) 2 days per week for 1 hour per day was implemented to help Chapter 1 students experience success in language arts. Eight home-school partnership workshops in English and Spanish were provided to the parents of all students. In addition, there was a 2-week program of daily parent involvement that included a home-school lending library. Results of student skills tests and pre- and post-program surveys indicated that the parent involvement program was the most successful part of the practicum. Although the at-risk students did show gains, the gains were not as expected. (Six appendixes include questionnaires, parent letter, extended day student survey, and early intervention for school success continuum.) (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TAC-B-437 PS 8656

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 382 405

Increasing Prevention of School Failure by Early Intervention for School Success of At-Risk Students Kindergarten through Grade Three

by

Marilyn R. Rogers

Cluster XXXIX

A Practicum II Report presented to the Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1993

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Marilyn R. Rogers
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

PS 023318

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRACTICUM APPROVAL SHEET

This practicum took place as described.

Verifier: James Enderson
James Enderson

Principal/Director of Instr. & Staff Dev.
Title

25890 Antelope Rd. Romoland, CA 92585
Address

July 14, 1993
Date

This practicum report was submitted by Marilyn R. Rogers under the direction of the adviser listed below. It was submitted to the Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

Approved:

Dec. 28, 1993
Date of Final Approval of Report

Wm. W. Anderson
William W. Anderson, Ph.D,
Adviser

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Writing this Practicum II report for Nova University as the final fulfillment of the doctoral studies in Early and Middle Childhood, has been a long term and committed process for this student.

It is with great pleasure that it is now completed and being carried on into this school year 1993-94. Hopefully, early intervention for all students with special needs will be addressed now and in the future. Every child deserves to be successful preventing school failure and the "at-risk" status.

Without the help and support of family and friends, but most of all the writer's husband, Richard, there would not be a doctor of education in the family. Colleagues, particularly, the principal and practicum verifier, James Enderson, have aided the writer during this long course. However, it was the writer's Cluster 39 Coordinator, Dr. Stanley Oliver, and Nova Adviser, Dr. William Anderson, who provided the encouragement and direction to persevere.

The writer wishes to also recognize and thank the Delta Kappa Gamma Society International members for their trust and belief to be honored with two scholarships. The first one came from the Chi State Scholarship Committee and the second from the International Scholarship Committee during these past two years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS. iii

LIST OF TABLES. iv

ABSTRACT. v

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION. 1

Description of Work Setting and Community. . .1
Writer's Work Setting and Role. 3

II STUDY OF THE PROBLEM. 6

Problem Description. 6
Problem Documentation. 9
Causative Analysis. 16
Relationship of the Problem
to the Literature. 21

III ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS. .61

Goals and Expectations. 61
Expected Outcomes. 62
Measurement Outcomes. 64

IV SOLUTION STRATEGIES 69

Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions. . . .69
Description and Justification for Selected
Solutions. 97
Report of Action Taken. 101

V RESULTS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 111

Results. 111
Outcome Analysis. 114
Discussion. 128
Recommendations. 138
Dissemination. 140

REFERENCES. 145

Appendices Page

A CHAPTER 1 PILOT EXTENDED DAY TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE #1. 155

B TEACHER NEEDS SURVEY REGARDING "AT-RISK" STUDENT SERVICES. 157

C PARENT/STUDENT LETTER. 161

D EXTENDED DAY STUDENT SURVEY 163

E EARLY INTERVENTION FOR SCHOOL SUCCESS (EISS) CONTINUUM. 165

F CHAPTER 1 EXTENDED DAY TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE #2. 170

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1 Results of Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised.126

ABSTRACT

Increasing Prevention of School Failure by Early Intervention for School Success of At-Risk Students in Kindergarten through Grade Three. Marilyn R. Rogers., 1993: Practicum II Report, Nova University, Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood. Descriptors: Elementary School Retention Prevention/Primary At-Risk Student School Success/Chapter 1 Program Students/Elementary ESL Program Students/Language Minority Students/Special Needs Students/Early Education Intervention/Emergent Literacy/Emergent Reading-Writing/ Family Literacy/Parent Involvement/Home-School Partnerships

This practicum aimed to increase early prevention of school failure for children in kindergarten through grade three by intervention which would provide school success for students who are at-risk. The attempted intervention was to identify and implement a developmentally appropriate program to assist these at-risk students to experience school success. Two corollary aims were to determine the causes of at-risk status before retention or school failure occurs and to involve parents in their children's educational process. This might include assisting the whole family with literacy problems, especially where a language other than English is spoken in the home.

An Extended Day Early Intervention Program (after-school) two days per week one hour per day was intended to assist at-risk students in Chapter 1, Chapter 1 LEP, and Chapter 1 Special Education programs to experience success in the area of language arts. Sponsored by the Chapter 1 Program, eight Home-School Partnership Workshops in English and Spanish were provided to the parents of all students. In addition, there was a two week program daily of parent involvement/ parent participation for the parents and their children enrolled in the Chapter 1 and Special Education Summer School Programs. This included a Home-School Lending Library. Chapter 1 and Special Education students could borrow books in English or Spanish to take home to read to their parents with worksheet-guidelines in both languages, for parents to become involved at home with their children's learning.

The parent involvement program was the most successful part of the practicum. While at-risk students did show gains, the gains were not as expected. Further work will follow to provide more success experiences for these at-risk youngsters. An Extended Day Early Intervention Program, kindergarten through grade three, will continue at both schools in this elementary school district.

*****

Permission Statement

As a student in the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies, I do (X) do not ( ) give permission to Nova University to distribute copies of this practicum report on request from interested individuals. It is my understanding that Nova University will not charge for this dissemination except to cover the costs of microfiching, handling, and mailing the materials.

December 28, 1993
(date)

Marilyn R. Rogers
(signature)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of the Work Setting and Community

The work setting is a Special Education Resource Specialist Program classroom in a rural two-school elementary school district, which has Head Start Preschool and kindergarten through grade six. Enrollment has increased from 275 students in the original school seventeen years ago to a total of 1,020 students in two schools and 34 in Head Start Preschool. The community has experienced an influx of families moving from larger cities in neighboring counties and also from primarily Spanish speaking countries.

The demographics of this school community are approximately 49% of the students have a Hispanic background, with an increase in the non-English proficient (NEP) and limited English proficient (LEP) population; other ethnic groups are Black 2% and Asian 1%. Although there are no teachers or administrators on staff with those ethnic backgrounds; English/Spanish bilingual instructional aides are working in classrooms at both schools. Many of the NEP/LEP students also qualify for Chapter 1 services. Nearly 65% of the students receive free or reduced lunch because they come

from families with a low income. Too often these students score below the 35th percentile on the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS), qualifying them to receive Chapter 1 program entitlement. A Chapter 1 instructional aide is assigned approximately one hour daily to each classroom that has Chapter 1 students in it.

Each Resource Specialist Program (RSP) involves up to 28 students in grades one through six. These students are enrolled in the general or regular education classrooms, but are identified as Individuals With Exceptional Needs (IWENS). Individual Education Plans (IEPs) can designate from 1% to 49% of the RSP students' school day to be serviced by the Resource Specialist. The Special Day Class (SDC) program is for students with greater needs, requiring 51% or more of their day being serviced in the special education classroom. All IWENS are mainstreamed into the regular education program with their peers wherever success can be met by these special needs students.

When students are experiencing failure, an alternative to placement in any of the categorical programs (i.e., Chapter 1, ESL/Bilingual, Special Education) is retention. Retention, transitional first grade, two years of kindergarten or immediate referrals to special education are for the most part not currently used, but was past school practice. The Student Study Team referral by the regular education classroom teacher is another alternative for a student experiencing school-related problems and special needs.

Writer's Work Setting and Role

The writer teaches in an elementary school with an average daily attendance near 500 students. At the beginning of the 1992-93 school year, the writer had a caseload of 25 special education students with active Individual Education Plans (IEPs) and placed in the Resource Specialist Program. An additional six students qualifed during the 1992-93 school year. Seven of the RSP students in grades two through four were also designated as students qualifying for Chapter 1 services. Six students in grades four, five and six qualified as students who are limited English proficient (LEP). RSP students who qualify for more than one categorical program should receive assistance within the regular classroom from Chapter 1 and bilingual instructional aides.

There are other at-risk students each year in kindergarten through grade four who are not identified early in order to receive adequate service to prevent school failure. They eventually may qualify for special education and become RSP students. Because the writer has recognized this student failure concern over the years within the role as a Resource Specialist, a "core team" for collaboration was attempted. The "core team" consists of the RS, the RSP aide and three mainstream classroom teachers working together by collaborating in both the RSP students' regular education classroom and the RSP classroom. This team has experienced some success in increasing services to all students with special

needs through cooperation and collaboration between the general/regular education and the special education staff.

To assist all the students with special needs, the writer has attempted to expand services even further. This entailed becoming a member of the school Chapter 1 Task Force, the Chapter 1 Extended Day program, and the Bilingual Intervention Team (BIT) for NEP/LEP students experiencing school related problems requiring program improvement.

Further attempts by the writer to assist at-risk stu- students has been to obtain Language Development Specialist Certification. The writer and other colleagues who teach ESL (English as a Second Language) are in consultant roles within the school district because of being involved in the Bilingual Methodology, Culture and other related graduate courses required.

The writer serves as a member for the Student Study Team to suggest modifications and interventions for the regular classroom teacher to follow. This includes the formal referral process to special education after every attempt to meet the child's needs, and when the parent requests a complete psychological and academic battery of assessments. Therefore, the writer also actively participates in the pre-referral consultant role to assist the regular classroom teacher and parent.

In addition, the writer works closely with the bilindual aide regarding NEP/LEP students and as a co-partner in teaching the Home-School Partnership workshops for Chapter

I, ESL/Bilingual Program, Special Education and General Education parents. Furthermore, the training and supervision of the Resource Specialist Program instructional aide is required as part of the role of the writer.

The writer's Bachelor of Arts academic degree is in Child Development. The writer also holds a Master of Arts degree in Special Education with certification both as a specialist in Early Childhood and in Learning Handicapped. Additionally, certification in the Resource Specialist Program and School Administration are held by the writer.

In a week-long training during the summer of 1992, the writer became updated as a statewide trainer for the Early Intervention for School Success (EISS) program. EISS encourages parent education and involvement.

As a member of Delta Kappa Gamma Society International, the project within the writer's chapter is Parents as Partners in Education. That commitment and involvement is expected within each chapter member's school setting.

As a part of this commitment as well as the parent involvement requirement for categorical programs, the writer and the bilingual aide/community liaison person were state department trained. The training was to provide monthly Home-School Partnership workshops for parents throughout the school year. Also, the writer presented parent involvement programs daily during the 1993 summer school. These were incorporated into the Chapter 1, ESL/Bilingual and Special Education program components and Practicum II completion.

CHAPTER II

STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description

The general at-risk student problem that has needed improvement in the writer's school is multifaceted, as described in the following:

Chapter 1 identified students who qualify for the Chapter 1 Program kindergarten through the third grade. Non-English speaking children qualify for another categorical program which is presently termed as English as a Second Language (ESL) or more commonly called the Bilingual Program. These are the students who are non-English proficient (NEP) or limited English proficient (LEP), with the long range goal of fluent English proficient (FEP) status. According to the records of Chapter 1 or LEP redesignation, few students are reaching the goals of either program.

Students enrolled in the Chapter 1 Program are often not the only students serviced by the Chapter 1 instructional aides. The instructional aides may be scheduled into the general or regular education classrooms with Chapter 1 students for one to two hours during the school day. However, the instructional aides also work with other students

experiencing school difficulty. The bilingual instructional aides are scheduled part day in the primary classrooms with the greatest number of NEP/LEP students, but only one hour daily beyond third grade.

Since Chapter 1 and NEP/LEP students are not receiving adequate assistance from the Chapter 1 and bilingual instructional aides, the students continue to remain in the Chapter 1 Program until service is discontinued after third grade. Furthermore, to no longer provide the Chapter 1 Program in the fourth through sixth grades and the ESL/ Bilingual Program for just one period a day, does not ensure student success. If unserviced or partially serviced, these students too often become "at-risk."

Students who are enrolled in both the Chapter 1 and in the ESL/Bilingual Programs also remain in these categorical programs without an adequate success rate. Students who are categorized as Chapter 1, NEP or LEP and Special Education do not receive all these services for the entire school day. As a consequence, students are not exiting from any of these compensatory education programs as planned. These and other students, who become "at-risk" when they do not succeed, are being "failed" by the educational system whether or not they are actually retained in a grade.

There is a lack of adequate articulation regarding "at-risk" students in Head Start Preschool plus common diagnostic assessment between Head Start, kindergarten staff, and others who could provide assistance. Developmentally

appropriate curriculum used in Head Start is not articulated to primary grades. Early intervention is particularly lacking for the linguistically and culturally diverse "at-risk" students.

Lastly, there are those students who are retained in kindergarten, first grade or sometimes beyond those early grades, by parent request, previous school policy or by recommendations of their regular classroom teacher. Since 1990, the writer's district does monitor and limit retention; however, in the 1987-1988 school year for example, approximately 2% of the students in kindergarten through the sixth grade were retained. Most of these students continued to experience school failure.

Although these above situations have been partially addressed by the district during this past year, the efforts are insufficient or ineffective or both without success. The areas that still lack improvement are: 1) diagnostic assessment, 2) early education curriculum techniques, 3) parent involvement strategies, 5) Chapter 1 and Chapter 1 NEP/LEP, Chapter 1-LEP-Special Education combined services for primary students or other students "at-risk."

Briefly stated then, the problem is: The early intervention services presently provided for "at-risk" students are not adequate or effective. Although viewed by some parents and educators as suitable, retention is not a solution for addressing the needs of students "at-risk."

Problem Documentation

Evidence of the multifaceted "at-risk" student problem is supported by the Chapter 1 Policy Manual, state reports, observations, interviews, conferences, student work, classroom checklists, test scores, student quarterly reports, teacher surveys, and staff development (e.g., Language Development Certificate requiring Bilingual Culture and Methodology classes):

1. Chapter 1 students do not receive adequate additional help from Chapter 1 instructional aides and/or parents to move above the 35th percentile when assessed on the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) given at the end of first, second and third grades. These and other students who are at-risk for school failure are not provided an appropriate developmental early intervention program as determined by CTBS scores, Language Assessment Scales (LAS) scores, and Student Study Team (SST) referrals.

2. Students who are culturally and linguistically diverse with a primary language other than English too often fall academically behind their English speaking peers by the third grade. In most cases in the writer's school these students' first language is Spanish. As (NEP) or (LEP), these students are not being taught in their primary

language throughout the entire school day. Sometimes before the third grade, they are failing in the system in which they are being taught. Eventually, they become referrals for Special Education, even when there may not be a learning disability.

3. Staff members were surveyed informally at the close of the 1991-92 school year and again after the first quarter of the 1992-93 school year regarding the communication between the Head Start Preschool and the kindergarten/first grade staff as students transfer from one program to the next. Unlike the prior years, these past few years there were yearly changes of the Teacher/Director in the Head Start Program; consequently, it appeared little communication and/or assessments and other records were exchanged between these two early education programs. A formal teacher needs survey (see Appendix B) verified the prior informal findings. Therefore, the mildly handicapped or developmentally delayed preschoolers and primary students may not be diagnosed/assessed early. The early intervention or even special education services, may have been needed earlier even before kindergarten or primary age. Unfortunately, these youngsters may be unserved or be delayed in service provision.

4. In the writer's elementary school, the administration had called together a Chapter 1 Task Force to be better prepared for the 1991-92 state department Coordinated Compliance Review (CCR) for the categorical programs in the writer's district. For the two prior school years the Chapter 1 Task Force did not review the plan. A District Chapter 1 Program goal which has not been met according to the CTBS scores is: Every Chapter 1 child will grow/achieve more than one year's growth reading/ language in a school year.

5. The staff was provided a Chapter 1 Inservice by County Schools' personnel with their expertise in Chapter 1 programs and funding. Still after the Task Force recommendations, students are not moving out of Chapter 1 programs to any degree. However, in 1991-92, 13 third graders who became fourth graders had scores above the 35th percentile on the CTBS tests given in May of each year. But in 1992-93 no child in Chapter 1 went above the 35th percentile in third grade. These students were automatically dismissed from the Chapter 1 Program the past year since it only goes through the third grade. There are always some fourth graders who do not score above the 35th percentile and receive no services beyond that level.

6. Although future planning was made during the summer of 1990 at the time the Chapter 1 Task Force worked to develop a new school plan for Chapter 1, these plans have not been enforced in total. This is particularly true in the area of parent involvement. The Chapter 1 Task Force recommendation for Chapter 1 School Planning in parent education which had not been met were: A) Create a focus for Chapter 1 parents, B) Generate activities for parents, C) Consider involvement of a school wide volunteer program, D) Create an Orientation Handbook for Volunteer Parents.

7. Observations and interviews were made by the State Department CCR team during the last review in 1992 which is on a three year cycle. The most significant area of non-compliance was academic instruction in the LEP students' primary language. The State Department CCR report in 1991 states: "Not all Limited English Proficient students requiring L1 academic instruction receive it." The non-compliant finding was restated as: "Although some primary language support is being provided to a limited extent, many LEP students are not receiving adequate support throughout the instructional day which inhibits their chances for optimum achievement."

8. The teacher survey results regarding Chapter 1 and NEP/LEP students were as follows: "10 out of 17 teachers when asked what area of improvement for at-risk students was needed responded students did not receive adequate services to meet their needs." Five teachers out of 17 did not return the survey.

9. In a meeting of Chapter 1 and LEP students' teachers involved in a four week pilot "after school tutoring," these questions were asked by the administrator/chairman: "What worked well?" The teachers said: "Small groups, the time was good, positive for kids, more attention provided, good attitude, built self-esteem and teachers loved the unstructured time with children." The chairman then said: "What do we need to improve upon?" The answers suggested were as follows: "ESL-primary language need for English oral language, need regular student attendance, would like more teachers involved so that more students could participate two days per week, but were not sure how long students should attend (e.g., semester or entire school year), how to address the needs of students who are IWENS, what interventions to use, the procedure for handling behavior problem students, referrals to Student Study Team, if little improvements could be observed after

interventions, considering carefully the referrals when working with extremely academically low students." There were mixed teacher reviews regarding which is best, working with their own students or exchanging students for the Extended Day Program. For the pilot, a vital question was posed regarding helping students improve: "Did you have enough diagnostic information for the Chapter 1 and LEP students?" Teachers responded negatively. Another question asked of this group was: "Were you able to identify and address weak areas or was instruction more general in nature?" The responses were: "more general" and with low readers - zeroed in on vocabulary. That question lead into: "What kind of materials, books, etc. do you need to be successful with these at-risk students?" After brainstorming, this is the partial list devised:

Spanish books	Puppets
ESL programs	Chart paper
Big Books	Storage containers
Felt material	Movable storage
Yarn	Computers
Felt story boards	Software

Yet another question posed was: "Do you see ways literacy issues can be addressed?" These were the responses:

Sit with children and read
Family literacy (e.g., how to read to child)
English Immersion (e.g., with a focus on oral language)
Have LEP "moms" with their children some of the time
Also have Child Care for parents

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Have all correspondence from school to home translated accurately

Lastly, this question was asked: "What key parent involvement/education issues would you like to see addressed?"

Involve parents in working with children--(i.e., assist these parents)
Homework - the place and the amount of time
Building Self-Esteem
Discipline
Encouraging responsible behavior (e.g., giving children chores - making sure they do their jobs)
How to communicate with teachers/school

10. There is a minority opinion by three teachers, that coming into the ESL/Bilingual/Resource classroom for any primary language instruction is a "waste of prime time" for some LEP students. With most teachers, however, the idea of alternating with the bilingual aide going into the regular classroom and having these students come to the ESL/Bilingual/Resource classroom is a better way for those students in that "in-between" language acquisition stage. This arrangement is looked upon with skepticism only by those teachers who do not feel comfortable with the bilingual instructional aide in their classrooms which is a minute number on the staff within the upper grade teachers.

11. The Individual's With Exceptional Needs (IWENS), who may also be Chapter 1 or Chapter 1 and LEP

or IWEN and LEP, cannot be served up to 50% of the day in special education because there is too little time left in the regular school day for help with Chapter 1 or bilingual instructional aides. Those students 51% or more of the day in the Special Day class (SDC), who may also be the Chapter 1 identified from the primary grades before being placed into SDC, or are LEP, also are not able to be served in all the categorical programs because of time and staff constraints.

12. At Student Study Team meetings the referring teachers have voiced their concern about the children who are at-risk and not getting the necessary help. Often the only recourse in the minds of referring teachers for a child who is failing is to retain the child, or see if they would qualify for Special Education services. The district has made policy during the past year and previously since 1990 to discourage retention as well as the two-year kindergarten concept and/or junior first grade.

Causative Analysis

It is the writer's belief that there are causes for the at-risk student problem:

In studying the problem from more than one perspective, the writer has seen the retention and Chapter 1 program

being modified since 1985. The first attempt was to screen all kindergartners upon school entrance by the Gesell Screening and placement in a two-year kindergarten program which was viewed as one answer for the developmentally immature child and later there became a kind of "protected" first grade for those who were at-risk.

There was also a training of first grade teachers to learn about the national early intervention screening and developmental program for those at-risk students which is entitled, Early Prevention of School Failure. However, the administration changed during that time and there was little follow up by the new administration during the next year or thereafter until now when the at-risk student problem resurfaces - particularly with the Chapter 1 and Chapter 1 NEP/LEP students.

The district and staff have supported the use of categorical funds primarily for Chapter 1 aides. Without adequate bilingual teaching staff, the only other possibility is for the district to hire more bilingual instructional aides which is being planned for in the near future. In kindergarten/first grades through grades three, bilingual instructional aides are needed at least one-half day where there are NEP or LEP students placed to provide the primary language instruction through preview-review techniques.

Scheduling Chapter 1 aides and the way their time has been spent is not in the best interest of the Chapter 1 students. The instructional aides help everyone in the

classroom, but are not providing direct help primarily to the Chapter 1 students. Sometimes the aides are not even fully informed in the classroom they are working of who are the Chapter 1 students. This is not necessarily the fault of these aides. Teachers require their assistance with the total program when there are students with a variety of needs.

It has been the responsibility of the administration to monitor the use of the Chapter 1 aides. Classroom teachers often express dissatisfaction with the time spent on one small group of students when others are at-risk as well, but who may not have qualified for Chapter 1 because of being new to the district or whatever other circumstances.

Discussions occurred during a Chapter 1 Parent Meeting regarding how the service is provided to these students by Chapter 1 aides in the classroom. Some parents went away from the meeting understanding their child was given extra help throughout the total school day by the Chapter 1 aides. Since the reality is Chapter 1 aides are scheduled throughout the kindergarten and primary grades one to two hours per classroom, the parents may have been mislead.

Students have difficulty making transfer from one program to the next. This has been historically the reason the district has not had a "pull-out" program for the Chapter 1 students. There had been, however, a "pull-out" ESL/Bilingual program for the NEP/LEP students up until this past year for all upper graders in that program. Teachers complain their students are missing too much being out of

the classrooms or they feel if the students speak adequate English to talk to the teacher and friends conversationally, they have learned enough English to stay in their classrooms for English language instruction. Even though the district has provided workshops to all staff on second language acquisition, some staff do not always practice the principles understood regarding the stages of language acquisition and that these students may only be in the first or second stages. They most likely do need additional help from the bilingual instructional aide in gaining more difficult concepts in English until they are provided the assistance of a bilingual teacher sometime in the future.

The students' NEP/LEP/FEP categories of language acquisition which can be referred to as culturally and linguistically diverse students, even though they are or are not English proficient, does not mean they are all dominant Spanish proficient either. Yet, these are another group of students put in categorical programs in the writer's school and elsewhere, or they may have "slipped through the cracks" of the education system and get no special services. The result is little or no academic success particularly in the area of language arts. One of the reasons for the confusion with these above described students' lack of success is that they may have been immersed in English before a solid foundation of their dominant language was established by being given little or no primary language instruction first.

Accurate and appropriate diagnosis of all children

who exhibit learning problems is too often tenuous. The exceptional child with a specific learning disability is also considered at-risk, but help is available when the IWEN is provided an Individual Education Program (IEP). If a student has an Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) or an Attention Deficit with Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), this student would be considered at-risk as well, but help may not be readily available. However, the ADD or ADHD child who is in addition classified as having a specific learning disability, at least will be able to receive special education services. The ADD or ADHD student, if diagnosed by a physician, can also receive special education as "other health impaired" providing the ADD or ADHD effects the learning potential of that student. The third handicapping condition to qualify a student for special education is if the lack of attention is causing a severe emotional disturbance. To compound any of these at-risk and handicapping conditions, if the child is NEP or LEP, that child may go inaccurately diagnosed or undiagnosed entirely. This becomes a real tragedy for the child's self-esteem as any other failure that is a consequence of bureaucratic entanglement.

In the case of the writer's school, there are between 49-53% Spanish speaking students with only a nominal number of other languages as the primary language occasionally. Primary language instruction for the Spanish dominant students is minimal. No bilingual teachers have been hired.

The pre-referral process by teachers who have "at-risk" students in their classes presently have expressed informally that referring these students to the Student Study Team (SST) is taking too long at the intervention stage. The writer is a member of the SST and the goal is to work with teachers and students at the intervention stage. This procedure stops formal referrals to special education as the only answer to student problems for the teacher. The SST should also be the support system for the frustrated classroom teacher with at-risk students who may or may not be afforded some type of compensatory education service. At any rate, the teacher sees little academic progress for those students being referred when asking for assistance.

From the formal and informal teacher survey and the opinion of the writer, the Head Start Preschool located at the writer's school, is not included in the "Grande Plan" of any early intervention program.

Relationship of the Problem to the Literature

By referring to the policy manual of Chapter 1 (1990), the writer considers an explanation of what is Chapter 1 applicable to the problem. The manual introduces Chapter 1 as: The Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988, Pub. L. 100-297, amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Part A of Chapter 1 of Title I, ESEA (Chapter 1), reauthorizes a program previously contained in

Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA). Part A of Chapter 1 provides financial assistance through educational agencies (SEAs) to local educational agencies (LEAs) to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in school attendance areas and schools with high concentrations of children from low-income families and the needs of children in local institutions for neglected or delinquent (N or D) children.

This assistance is to improve the educational opportunities of educationally deprived children by helping them succeed in the regular program, attain grade-level proficiency, and improve achievement in basic and more advanced skills that all children are expected to master.

Second Language Acquisition Challenge

Bowman (1991) in her concern with educating language-minority children compares child development following a similar pattern to that of culture. She states "major structural changes in children, such as language learning, arise from the interaction of biology and experience." These changes are similar in kind and sequence within cultural groups. This cultural learning, which is the knowledge and skills that a child acquires upon reaching different ages, definitely depends on that same child's family but also the community. The uses of a language are determined by the culture and learning the use of a primary language is one of the miracles of the child's early childhood.

Learning the primary language ideally would be a developmentally appropriate educational objective. Within the classroom children are faced with the challenge of communication. If children whose past experience with a language differs from that in the classroom, this non-congruence effects the language learning process. When children and adults come from different cultures or use of languages or dialects differ, teachers and students may not understand one another in their thought processes because they do not share common experiences and beliefs.

Bowman asks the rhetorical question, is it possible to design a developmentally appropriate curriculum? She says the answer is no, if that means the same curriculum can be used for all children. It is the educators challenge to assess each child's developmental level and to find common experiences to promote growth in order to measure achievement of educational objectives.

Bowman concludes with "a developmentally appropriate curriculum can never be standardized in a multicultural community." Teachers who are sensitive to this reality will help children find school to be meaningful through the principles of child development and to assure self-confidence within all children.

Trute (1991) discusses how educators within heavy immigrant areas have a challenge to meet the educational needs of the children within this group. This is especially true for the immigrant populations of other languages than

English, coming into Florida as well as California. However, it is not only the language deficit that must be dealt with in these populations. There are many factors to consider explains Trute which include the physical, social, and psychological needs which these children must have addressed by the schools throughout America. The writer sees that the intellectual needs should also be included in meeting these basic human needs. These students often come non-equipped for the role of "student" for they may have never been to school or they lack the skills and knowledge of the behavior expected of students.

In addition, these children may lack a solid foundation of their primary language because of poor role modeling by their parents. Often the parents are deficient in their own education necessary to help their children.

Public schools serving these students are experiencing a greater influx of immigrants than ever before in history. Teachers have not been prepared to teach English as a Second Language to the degree that is in demand. The curriculum must be adapted and modified which include other teaching strategies.

Adams (1987) met the challenge of developing a program and implementing a proposed solution through a pilot project for NEP and LEP children. However, initially the legal precedents were addressed. The Supreme Court case of 1974, Lau v. Nichols, where the San Francisco Unified School District failed to provide all non-English speaking students

with special instruction to equalize their educational opportunity was explored by Adams initially. Keeping in mind this class action suit should be the focus of any program for language minority students in the public schools.

The next court decision was the case of Keyes v.Denver. Adams' search established that on December 30, 1983, a Federal District Court in Colorado found the Denver Public Schools in violation of the Equal Education Opportunity Act of 1974 for their failure to provide adequate programs for LEP students. Tantamount to Lau v. Nichols, the primary point made by Adams is that there is a legal obligation to assist all LEP students even if there is only one student of a given language group.

Adams further points to the laws passed and the funding provisions by the Federal Government for the children with limited English proficiency. They are as follows:

1. The 1968 Bilingual Education Act or Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) of 1965
2. In 1974 The Bilingual Act was passed and superseded the 1968 Act
3. In 1978 The Bilingual Education Act, Public Law 95-561

This last act required the schools to teach "(a) some degree of each of the child's language, (b) some degree of English, (c) some degree of each child's native heritage, (d) some degree of the cultures of all children in the United States, and (e) maintain some degree of class

integration" quotes Adams from the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1979, p.3 (Adams, 1987, p.40).

Adams followed the above guidelines in developing his practicum project for LEP students.

Special Education Language Minority Students

All too often language and cultural differences displayed by Spanish-dominant students cause them to be labeled as learning disabled explains Ainsa (1984). The most significant information gleaned from this article are the characteristics shared by learning disabled students and Spanish language students in the resource room. The characteristic frequency percentages to the nearest ten are:

Delayed language acquisition - 40%
Low level speaking and reading vocabulary - 80%
Low average range of intelligence in some (not all) academic areas - 90%
Poor auditory memory - 40%
Difficulty concentrating - 80%
Difficulty understanding symbols - 20%
Little attention span - 80%
Difficulty sequencing - 20%
Withdrawn - not accepted by peers - 60%
Poor social judgment and reasoning - 40%
"Doesn't care" or no persistence - 40%
Little retention of information - 50%
Poor self-concept - 60%
Frustration-anger response - 60%
Poor visual memory/comprehension - 40%
Doesn't understand directions - 40%
Poor arithmetic reasoning - 40%
Excessive absence/avoids school - 60%

As can be noted, many of the characteristics shown above are similar to those of learning disabled students. Therefore, many English language deficient will be placed in special education instead of English as a Second Language

classes sites Ainsa. Ainsa suggests meeting the special needs of these students by the following:

1. Intensive English as a second language concentration in the curriculum. The ESL course content should be geared to "classroom English" so that this vocabulary would help the students with academic subjects.

2. Testing for educational placement should be performed after the student has been in ESL classes, and before the student has been labeled learning disabled.

3. Equip teachers with a knowledge of the Spanish language and Mexican-American culture that is ongoing in order for them to differentiate between what is culture differences from learning disabilities.

4. Make use of vocational education which could also be incorporated into the resource room curriculum or outside in regular vocational classes.

5. Equip teachers with appropriate curriculum materials designed for the Spanish-speaking youngsters.

The difficulty of distinguishing genuine learning disabilities from second-language-acquistion problems are current issues in the field of bilingual special education.

Within these issues Cummins (1989) discusses the problem in relation to the nature of language proficiency and intellectual development, plus models of teaching and learning and the sociology of dominant-subordinate group interaction.

Cummins theoretical framework takes on the causes of minority students' academic difficulties from a different starting point. Cummins finds they are to be found in the ways schools have reinforced, both overtly and covertly, the discrimination that certain minority groups have

historically experienced in the society at large.

Further, it has been argued by Cummins "that minority students will be empowered in the school context to the extent that the communities themselves are empowered through their interactions with the school. When educators involve minority parents as partners in their children's education, parents appear to develop a sense of efficacy that communicates itself to children--with positive academic consequences" (Cummins, 1989 p.115).

Disadvantaged Children, Chapter 1 and IDEA Program Models

In educating disadvantaged children, a look at a report by the United States Department of Education (1987) regarding what schools can do to help disadvantaged children can determine what works. The report recommends actions and what works in some outstanding schools. These include eight steps:

1. Mobilize students, staff, and parents around a vision of a school in which all students can achieve.
2. Create an orderly and safe school environment by setting high standards for discipline and attendance.
3. Help students acquire habits and attitudes necessary for progress in school and later life.
4. Provide a challenging academic curriculum.
5. Tailor instructional strategies to the needs of disadvantaged children.
6. Help students with limited English become proficient and comfortable in the language as soon as possible.

7. Focus early childhood program on disadvantaged children to increase their chances for success.

8. Reach out to help parents take part in educating their children.

A Chapter 1 program which opens minds for success is what everyone desires who is involved with the federally funded program. Magruder (1990) discusses a boy named Billy who was diagnosed at age 7 as having a learning disability. Through a Chapter 1 lab in Mesa, Arizona schools students in prekindergarten through sixth grades attend Chapter 1 summer schools.

The prekindergarten program is for children who have not been to preschool and are "at-risk" of not being able to keep up in kindergarten.

Billy entered Chapter 1 at second grade in which he spent 30 minutes a day with four other children and a teacher in a lab setting. Billy couldn't accurately copy words from the chalkboard to paper because of his dyslexia (learning disability), but he could use a computer keyboard.

One of the primary goals of Chapter 1 is to increase the child's self-esteem through success experiences. Billy felt better about himself as he improved academically which also improved his "acting-out" behavior in class.

Chapter 1 schools are chosen based on the number of free and reduced-price lunches served in the cafeterias. Once a school has been designated, any child can apply for their program regardless of the family's income level according to what the principal shared of that Mesa school.

It is the writer's experience with Chapter 1 that students qualify for the program according to how the plan is written. In the writer's school at present, the program is only for kindergarten through third grade with Chapter 1 Aide assistance. Selected students have been involved in an after-school program for 45 minutes two days per week.

In a critical analysis where other literature relates problems created in resource programs when only the "pull-out" model is primarily used, would also be true of bilingual and Chapter 1 pull-out programs. Wiederholt and Chamberlain (1989) emphasize "a resource room is an important part of a complete resource program" suggesting "the resource concept is not new" (Wiederholt & Chamberlain, p. 15). The rationale and history of the five types of resource models is given and this resource model approach includes assessment, teaching and consulting services as used in special education, but could also be a model for a Bilingual/Chapter 1 resource room. The role of the resource teacher is to assess, instruct, consult and yet there is extreme variation among resource programs in general. Many schools do confine their Chapter 1, resource and Bilingual/ESL programs to the resource room only which is otherwise known as the "pull-out" model. This model has its limitations for special education or any other categorical program if used alone for services provided to any student with special needs.

President Bill Clinton campaigned on the issue of

investing more in education. "Hence, it would seem that significant funding should be put behind any major proposals emanating from the White House in the area of education in 1993" (Jennings, 1992, p. 306). Federal programs considered successful, such as Head Start and Chapter 1, have narrowed the achievement gap over the last 25 years between black children and white children. "But now is the time to address legitimate criticisms made of the program: an overemphasis on rote tasks, labeling of children as slow, and an apparent dissipation of gains after departure from the program" (p. 306).

Categorical programs now administered by the U.S. Department of Education include the two major programs it operates, Chapter 1 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Hopefully, Clinton will request appropriations to enlarge these currently effective federal programs.

Chapter 1 has achieved much in the 27 years of its existence, but even good programs can be made better sites Jennings. Congress had that issue as the first order of business this year in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Assisting Students At-Risk

A further review of the literature gives evidence that the appropriate early intervention programs to assist students at-risk, prevents school failure as well finds ways to

meet the special needs of students and saves the self-esteem of these students by replacing failure with success.

The preliminary literature review suggested that every child can learn and Slavin and Madden (1989) have completed a study of what works for students at-risk. These authors state that "every student without severe dyslexia or retardation could attain an adequate level of basic skills" (Slavin & Madden, 1989, p. 4). They go on to ask the question of "Who is 'at-risk'?" The answer is anyone who is in danger of failure to complete any part of his or her education without an adequate level of skill development.

To define those risk factors according to Slavin (1989) is included low achievement, retention in any grade, behavior problems, poor attendance, low socioeconomic status, and attendance at schools with large number of poor students. In addition, these at-risk students become potential "drop-outs" which can be predicted by the third grade.

Sadly, "a practical criterion for identifying students at-risk is eligibility for Chapter 1, special education, or other remedial services under today's standards" (Slavin & Madden, 1989, p. 4).

Kagan (1988) did a study of at-risk students beginning with the most obvious characteristic which is academic underachievement. Kagan states there is solid evidence for using other characteristics such as family background socio-emotional functioning. In this study the subjects were elementary age in grades one through seven.

Teachers were asked to turn in the names of students in their classes whom they regarded as potentially at-risk. "They were asked to use the following definition in their selection: An at-risk student is one who (a) has sufficient intellectual ability but consistently obtains low grades, (b) has low motivation and appears indifferent to school, and (c) appears to have marginal ability and becomes frustrated or withdrawn because of lack of success" (Kagan, 1988, p. 320). Results of this study suggest the use of objective assessment instruments and for teachers to focus on concrete or obvious behaviors in attempting to identify potentially at-risk students.

Cavazos (1989) discusses building bridges for at-risk children since intervention at every level is essential to reverse this alarming rise of dropouts who are marginally literate or functionally illiterate. She says that "today's dropout was yesterday's at-risk student" (Cavazos, 1989, p. 7). The writer found these words of the author thought provoking: An at-risk student was once a very young child in need of intervention. Cavazos reminds us that nearly half our Hispanic and black students begin to fall behind in the primary grades and once they fall behind one or two grade levels, they almost never catch up. This information is highly motivating to the writer to help in building bridges for the at-risk students referred to the Student Study Team while preventing others from becoming at-risk.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appropriate Curriculum

The literature reveals several causes for teachers of young children having problems with tasks in the curriculum not appropriate for some students. Brewer (1987) reports that it may not be that the students are slow learners or the curriculum is inappropriate, but instead that the students are simply not ready for the tasks presented by the teachers. If these students are still in the pre-operational stage of development even though they may be beyond the age usually thought of as pre-operational. These children may be fooled by their perception because they lack the ability to conserve.

For example, if a reading program begins with phonics instruction only as readiness to reading, these children may have trouble keeping in mind what the words are while they are being analyzed and put back together. Therefore, the Whole Language Approach would be a much wiser choice by the teacher when developing curriculum. Concrete thinkers must be given concrete learning experiences before they can deal with symbolic tasks as identified by Piaget. To the surprise of some educators who would think this would only be true of preschoolers and kindergartners, even first and second graders may not have completed the transition between pre-operational and concrete thinking. Classroom teachers can find out if students are ready or not by five simple tasks provided by Brewer. They are: 1.) Give the child a set of red and a set of blue plastic chips. The child determines if

the sets are or are not equal when the chips from one set are rearranged spatially. Brewer discusses comparing equal sets when one of the sets occupies more space is the classic task for determining if a child conserves number. 2.) Give the child a set of red and a larger set of blue plastic chips. Have the child determine if there are more blue or more plastic chips. An example question for task two: "Are there more blue chips or plastic chips?" Brewer says: "Difficulties with multiplicative classification are revealed by the child's answer." 3.) Give the child two pencils that are exactly alike. Ask the child to compare their lengths--first when they're held so that their ends are exactly even, and then when they're held with one and extending past the other. "This is an easy way to check for conservation of length" Brewer continues. 4.) Give the child a necklace made of a shoelace strung with five large wooden beads and the material for reproducing the necklace. Have the child reconstruct the pattern of the beads on the shoelace as they would appear if they were in a straight line. "The ability to reproduce a circular pattern of beads in a straight line is an indication of reversibility of thinking" shares Brewer. 5.) Give the child a set of identical paper dolls that are graduated in size from two inches to ten inches tall. Ask the child to order the dolls from largest to smallest.

"Ordering paper circles from largest to smallest requires that the child hold in mind the circle just placed

while considering the next circle" (Brewer, 1987, p. 98).

After trying the above tasks with students at-risk, teachers can capitalize on appropriate learning tasks. Current approaches in early education presented by Day (1986) are reiterated by the Report of the School Readiness Task Force (1988) regarding whether children who don't do well in kindergarten should be moved to a regular first grade or transitional classroom. Day says that means developmentally delayed children are then placed in a homogeneous group which says to the child at five or six years old that he/she is a failure in school.

Day points out to the reader the problem is not where the child is developmentally because it is perfectly appropriate that a child should be at this particular stage in his or her life. **The challenge to educators is to provide a program based on the child's needs altering the program to fit the child instead of insisting the child adapt to the program.** This belief in developmental early childhood education is verified by the task force members by their recommendations.

Empowering Students and Families with Literacy

Literacy instruction for linguistically different learners calls for some adaptations to the practice of process instruction when teaching reading and writing.

With limited and non-English-speaking students, assumptions are too often made these students will benefit from

the whole language and writing process as will the majority group. De La Luz Reyes (1992) makes a strong appeal for efforts to be made by teachers to tailor literacy instruction to account for the cultural and linguistic diversity in all students. If teaching practices are to be inclusive of all learners, they must "begin with the explicit premise that each learner brings a valid language and culture to the instructional context" (De La Luz Reyes, 1992, p. 427).

This author sites four assumptions by educators considered too often as if they were venerable--too sacred to challenge--which are: 1.) English is the only legitimate medium for learning and instruction; 2.) linguistic minorities must be immersed in English as quickly as possible if they are to succeed in school; 3.) a "one size fits all" approach is good for all students; 4.) error correction in process instruction hampers learning.

Attention to the development of literacy, rather than to the acquisition of English, not only permits LEP students opportunities to taste writing success in their own language, it also provides them with the confidence to attempt writing in English.

Chan (1988) explains how experienced teachers of writing already know about teaching LEP students to write even if they don't realize it. These teachers may not be sure how much the composing processes of nonnative speakers of English looks like what native speakers can do. This may prevent teachers of ESL from adapting what they do know about

teaching writing to native speakers in teaching nonnative speakers to write in the ESL classrooms. An example of this is the use of journals in teaching the writing process. Teachers should work with students through the process while using questions to guide revision. ESL writers can also be paired with older native speakers or older nonnative speakers to help in giving feedback when the student reads his/her work.

The organization of a cooperative learning classroom where assisting others in completing academic tasks was more important than individual competition. An additional support system accompanying process instruction should include such things as teacher's preselection of books; reading with a partner; oral reading by the teacher; checking for comprehension in Spanish or other minority language; reading English-language books while permitting discussion and written responses in the students' first language; sharing students' first language and English written work in the "author's chair"; and providing multiple checkpoints for correcting and learning grammar, spelling, and punctuation from the teacher, peers, and parents.

It might appear that the above suggestions for using whole language and the writing process were applicable to only second-language learners; however, the writer views these suggestions also appropriate to use with learning disabled or other at-risk students to assure success.

The High-Scope K-3 Program promotes key experiences in

language and literacy development. In the Whole Language curriculum are fundamental learning objectives that contribute to mastery in oral and written language. These are not just narrowly focused objectives that are just checked off after mastery, but instead key experiences used as guides to generate literacy activity. They are repeated frequently because these experiences promote growth in language skills. Each and every time a child is involved in any of the key experiences, there is the opportunity to broaden learning while also interpreting just what has been learned--not just for more practice.

The High-Scope K-3 Curriculum guide involves the acts of speaking, listening, writing and reading in a language rich environment where purposeful communication, supportive veral interaction, active use of print resources, and children's literature predominate. High-Scope Foundation (1990) supports children speaking in their own language or dialect. Key experiences do acknowledge the progressive nature of language and literacy development; children are certain to observe and make connection between the spoken and written language in their minds before they write continuous text and poetry. Yet children may approach learning to read by writing. The key experiences of children help teachers to identify and build on children's individual strengths. Typical language and literacy expectations for kindergartners through third-graders can be distinguished by a general sequence of growth events, but cannot be laid out by

a strict set of sequenced activities for children to follow.

Werner (1987) gives an overview of the Early Prevention of School Failure, a nationally validated diffusion program designed to prevent school failure through early identification of 4 to 6 year old children's developmental skills and learning styles. The program includes a screening battery which is administered by a professional team. The purpose of the screening is to determine the developmental levels of modality skills needed for reading and writing success. Both the screening and curriculum are available in English, Spanish, Cambodian, Laotian, and Vietnamese.

The research indicates that parents can and do help their children with language development. Children were found to score higher on reading tests when their parents read to them and otherwise encourage them including asking questions about what they read. Parents should also engage their children in meaningful conversations and other use of the language. Dutton and Dyer (1991) state the literature is still unclear about what is possible for parents who are limited in their use of English.

In the writer's experience, it is just as important for the non-English speaking parent to read to the child in his or her own language as well as meaningful conversations with the child. However, there are those parents in English and non-English households who are illiterate in written language and cannot read. Schools need to reach out to these parents with literacy programs. Family literacy projects are

available in California. The Family English Literacy Program (FELP) is administered under ESEA, Title VII.

Parental Involvement

Powell (1991) provides approaches to supporting parents through parent education programs. However, he makes a point of saying the term "parent education" is something that evokes an image of "the expert" lecturing to a group of mothers about the ages and stages of childhood. At federal, state and local levels there is a definite aim at support for families with young children.

One of the most important federal efforts more recently is the Education for Handicapped Act Amendments (Public Law 99-457) which assists states in offering early intervention services from infancy through toddler-hood with families participating in those services. Powell emphasizes "this law strengthens the commitment to parent involvement set forth in Public Law 94-142, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975." Educators and policymakers can continue to find strategies for working toward the child's development and education. Without the support of schools for parents, the opportunity for a partnership is missed when it is realized the family's contributions are vital to the child's growth and development.

Parent involvement has been a mandate in such programs as Head Start, Chapter 1, Bilingual and Special Education, but the California Department of Education in 1988 and 1989

led the nation with state law mandating parent involvement in school districts and schools.

The California Department of Education (1992), along with the Parenting and Community Education Office, prepared recommendations for transforming schools through family-community-school partnerships, with a strategic plan for parental involvement in education.

In school reform initiatives of the future, Bell (1993) outlines parent involvement by initially paying more attention to that "other educational institution: the home." Learning how to motivate parents, workers in childcare centers, and others to make after-school hours and weekends more productive, can automatically initiate parent involvement after we begin a tradition of parents and their children's schools working together.

Brown (1989) tells how to involve parents in the education of their children. One such kind of involvement is what most teachers have accepted and that is participating in parent conferences and other functions which includes receiving and responding to written communications from the teacher. "Parents can also serve as school volunteers for the library or lunchroom, or as classroom aides," says Brown. However, parents can participate in their children's schools by joining Parent-Teacher clubs and getting involved in some of the decision making about the educational services available to their children. Another way the writer has found to involve parents is called "home-based" by

Brown. This type of involvement focuses on what parents can do at home with their children by the teacher sending home books for the parent to read or browse with their child. Home visits are especially effective, but require a great deal of extra time on the part of the teacher.

Other At-Risk Student Issues

The research on school readiness and kindergarten retention is noted by Shephard and Smith (1986). Being the youngest in their class has always been a problem for children, particularly in kindergarten and first grade. However, the third grade the academic differences seem to pretty much disappear. Regardless of the entrance age requirement, however, the youngest children are always at a slight disadvantage. Some parents voluntarily wait a year to start their child in school if they feel the child is too young, but this policy should not be encouraged. Many school districts assess children's readiness for school. These assessments have not proven to be particularly advantageous for anyone--especially the child.

Kindergarten and first grade retention is common practice with a number of school districts even today. "By the time they complete first grade, children who have repeated kindergarten do not out-perform comparison students; they did, however, have slightly more negative feelings about school. There is no achievement benefit in retaining a child in kindergarten or first grade and, regardless of how well

the extra year is presented to the child, the child still pays an emotional cost" (Shepard & Smith, 1986, p. 80).

Friesen (1984) researches the literature to support the proposition that overplacement is a significant cause of school failure. This author takes the opposite position about retention. The writer believes this is because the research is somewhat older. However, Friesen discusses alternatives one could consider to avoid overplacement. They are: 1.) Assuming the child is of normal intelligence, the author asks the question, "Isn't holding him back better than advancing him to a class where he will always be in over his head?" 2.) The author also suggests screening preschoolers for readiness and encouraging parents to delay their children's entry into kindergarten by a year if they are developmentally immature. 3.) Organizing transition first-grade classes for those not ready for first grade, but would be promoted to a Transitional 1 class--an all day class similar to first grade but with a curriculum which, while advanced from kindergarten, is not as structured and fast-moving as the regular first grade curriculum. This transition class concept would eliminate most kindergarten retention and reduce the difficulty of deciding whether to advance a youngster to first grade if one is in doubt. 4.) Changing the state entry-age laws to provide that children do not enter kindergarten until they are fully five years old. Friesen continues to remind the reader of being aware "that not all children are ready for formal academic study

at the same time."

Curry (1982) believes that the worst scenario for a kindergarten teacher or any teacher, is when the parents must hear that their child is going to be held back in a grade. Parents can take this very hard--may even more so in their child's first year in school. This is especially true when the child is verbal and appears to the parent as being "very smart." There is some softening of the blow if the teacher is offering an alternative such as a transitional first. However, other critics Shepard and Smith (1986) and Leinhardt (1980) still view kindergarten retention as not promoting maturation, but as possibly reducing education.

Yet Curry claims that one mother was willing to have each of her three children spend a second year in kindergarten which gave them a better chance for success in school beyond kindergarten. Curry believes that retention in kindergarten has never proved anything but a positive experience for the less mature youngsters in her classroom.

Peck (1989) argues that one option which has always been available for at-risk children is kindergarten retention. Somehow educators have believed that retaining kindergartners didn't feel the social pressures they would at other grades. At least some educators now realize as the writer, that retention is a practice to avoid if at all possible. However, it is suggested that transitional or developmental classes are preferred to retention. This is especially true if programs for at-risk students are at-risk

themselves because of lack or shortage of funds.

Leinhardt (1980) did a study with kindergartners promoted with an Individual Learning Plan (ILP) type program. These former kindergartners out performed both similar retained students and students placed in a transitional room environment.

Alternatives to retention can take many forms as possible remedial interventions. In a study by Peterson, DeGracie and Ayabe (1987) they found that the use of an individualized support program, such as used with many LEP children in the form of an ILP, can result in increased achievement gains. This concept is designed to meet each student's needs which could also be compared to the IEP used for special education students. At least these provide a direction instead of just more of same as the previous year regarding the child's education. Comparing the at-risk student who may be headed for special education, retention is not the answer because the student has a problem which cannot be remediated simply by another year in the same grade.

Recent data on retention was collected by Clary (1993) at the elementary level of 24 school districts in Arkansas. There was a difference in the number of students retained by grade level which included almost 15,000 students in grades K-6. There was a high 8.4% for grade 1 to a low of 1.3% for grade 6 with a total percentage of children retained in grades K-6 at 4%. The total number of students retained were in grades K-1 which was almost 55%.

The author believes that the data indicates K-3 teachers are not only more positive about retention in these grades, but they follow this belief with action. Clary asks, "How can a practice whose validity has been questioned time and again in the literature continue to remain acceptable to such a wide audience of administrators, teachers, parents, and students?"

Tasting failure is all too often what students who are at-risk face on a daily basis in our schools. A series of everyday mistakes in the tasks at hand may even go unnoticed by the teacher especially if the young child is quite verbal. But what about the child who is quiet--hardly noticed at all amongst the large group in the classroom? Conner (1987) answers quiet students who are less willing to talk are often misunderstood, overlooked, labeled as "different," and are less likely to be included in the mainstream of school life.

"Students' use of their verbal ability affects the form and quality of their educational experience and even influences the judgments teachers make about them" says Conner. Quiet children, on the other hand, who on standardized test results indicate they are capable of learning, too often are still failing continues Conner. They suffer from a high level of Oral Communication Apprehension which inhibits them from reaching their full potential.

In two instances educators themselves feel the brunt of what it feels like to not quite fit into the "classroom

mold." Ruhland (1993) discusses the daydreamer, the doodler, the quiet child who may even attempt becoming the class-clown just to be noticed among the popular people.

Today as a teacher who was that quiet child, Ruhland, remembers and discusses the moral to this story--that is, quiet kids are most often fine, just quiet. Teachers can use the opportunity to meet students where they are calling forth growth to avoid the at-risk student syndrome.

Hill (1991) remembers the pain of failure while in a workshop with other colleagues. The task was probably designed for children and yet Hill explains how spatial understanding was not an intelligence in his repertoire.

Recalling other incidents of failure which required the same kind of intelligence was painful. Those negative thoughts were interfering with the present learning. Connner (1987) reflects on this episode as a learner and suggests getting in touch with the at-risk learner in every teacher so as not to forget the feeling of failure.

The writer will use the term "gray" students as does Bishopp (1987) to describe the overlooked group of students who are underachieving. Their special needs require an alternative learning experience for this unique special kind of student. These students are potential "drop-outs" because they just don't belong, have few friends and don't get involved with school activities. Putting these students into learning disabled or even gifted and talented programs, but this has traditionally been what is available. Bishopp

looks at a different kind of program that would include: team teaching, adjoining classrooms, flexible scheduling, group building activities and counseling.

Although this was a junior high program, why couldn't this begin with fourth, fifth and sixth graders? Finding real opportunities to be successful learners for children at-risk requires special strategies. Conditions that can affect children's learning are numerous.

However, Stevens and Price (1992) look at these conditions carefully for these put children at risk of school failure as much as any other aspect discussed in the literature.

Facts that educators must address if these children are to reach their full potential to name a few are: the 350,000 newborns each year exposed prenatally to drugs, including alcohol, more than 300,000 school-age children are homeless each year, and some three to four million children have been exposed to damaging levels of lead.

Additionally, the incidence of pediatric infection with HIV (human immunodeficiency virus) has risen dramatically in recent years, affecting some 15,000 to 30,000 children. One to two million are subject to abuse, and of the 37,000 babies born each year weighing less than 3 1/2 pounds who live long enough to leave the hospital, many will face substantial learning problems as a result of medical intervention.

At-risk students who may be abused children can become abusive parents and continue this violation of children in

our society.

"The data collected in the Phi Delta Kappa Study of Students at Risk underscore the point that teachers and others in schools are working hard - very hard - to help those children for whom growing up is risky business" (Frymier, 1992, p. 257). However, from this study completed in 1989, it was found that in each of the 594 comparisons made on risk factors of personal pain and academic failure all of the students who were at risk on one item (e.g., had been abused). There were 406 of the 21,706 students in the study were reported by their teachers to have been physically or sexually abused.

"The substantial population of children at risk means that teachers will face such children in their classrooms in increasing numbers and that administrators must plan to provide appropriate services for them" (Stevens & Price, 1992, p. 18).

No matter what is the case with the home environment, better services could be provided from the school. To bridge the gap between home and school, there could be the concept of "one stop shopping" at the school location. Such services as routine health check-ups and immunizations, library services open to the public in the local community, family literacy programs, and child care could be made available, to name a few of the possibilities to consider. Parents need the support and help from their local schools.

Troppmann (1991) asks the question, "Who is really

at-risk?" This term "at-risk" can become a catch-all for every possible problem that schools can't or won't solve, because the governor, legislature or community may not choose to face. Troppmann argues that responsible adults must face the need for all students to be successful. No child has to be "at-risk" or "slipping through the cracks" in the public school system. It must become unacceptable to expect anything less. Troppmann continues with "knock down those barriers together and begin to work to guarantee the tomorrow we thought was ours."

Building in Success with Learning

Using a literature-based reading program with same age peers says Eldredge and Butterfield (1984), provides an opportunity to use a modified neurological impress method of teaching reading with peer tutoring.

Topping (1989) has used a second peer tutoring approach called Paired Reading combined with the above provides some powerful techniques. These techniques allow for tutees to be supported through texts of higher readability levels than they would be able to read independently. This ensures adequate stimulation and participation for the tutor, who also has an important role in promoting understanding through discussion and questioning, suggests Topping.

Dixon and Nessel (1983) provide the Language Experience Approach (LEA) to reading instruction which is not a new idea. So, if to introduce or reacquaint, teachers who trust

a natural way of helping learners acquire oral, aural, reading, and writing skills, will find this method particularly useful in meeting the needs of students for whom English is a second language. However, the use of Language Experience is a carry-over from early childhood education programs of the past and present now that schools see the value of this approach in teaching Whole Language.

Language Experience is a method whereby the whole class can participate in a common experience and the teacher has the students tell about their experience. Either a whole class story can be written by the teacher or each child can tell and dictate their story to a volunteer, or cross-age tutor, instructional assistant or the teacher. The story is written down for the child to read back. As the child gets used to this process the child can copy below what has been written and then read back. A child can be immediately successful with reading when they read what they know about from their own experience.

Kelly (1993) discusses a successful reading program begins with daily reading of literature because reading aloud to children stimulates their interest and imagination. The emotional development and use of the language is also another aspect of the value of reading aloud reminds Trelease (1990).

Students can respond to literature in a variety of ways which can promote other means of success with reading and language. Students may engage in art, science and math

activities related to books read. These can be placed about the classroom to show children their work is valued. Children also can have the opportunity to share books and ideas to others. They can also respond by writing reviews they have read, but first students should have the opportunities to experiment with writing their own stories and poems which are stimulated by the books they have heard or read. This works with all children, but those with special needs do especially benefit.

Exploring Model Success Interventions/Programs

The Early Intervention for School Success Program began when Los Angeles Senator Diane Watson authorized the Early Intervention for School Success (EISS) bill in 1985, and "it was hoped that 200 schools would be participating by 1991." As of January, 1992, over 400 schools were participating, with 130 more scheduled to begin in 1992-93. Senator Watson saw an opportunity in this program to help schools and parents focus more clearly on children's learning needs at the beginning of their school careers. She understood that if teachers can learn to know their children well in kindergarten, and are supported in providing age appropriate instruction, children will prosper. Governor Pete Wilson recognized the savings to California generated by reducing grade repeaters and special education placements. The Governor made EISS part of his prevention initiatives in 1991-92 and, with the Legislature, nearly tripled the impact of this Program"

(Hiser, Benn, & Smith, 1992, p. 1).

Such moves as the Regular Education Initiative (REI) and Full Inclusion for all students question the value of special education interventions. Many researchers have indeed found limited benefit to out of classroom interventions and yet there are regular classroom teachers who view support to the student who is at-risk as beneficial. However, pre-referral support can be viewed as one more stumbling block on the way to removal of difficult students from their classrooms.

Regarding the term "inclusion", Martin (1993) as a member of LDA, Learning Disabilities Association, has been concerned that the move toward "inclusion" might keep some students from leaving the regular classroom to receive needed services while at the same time dumping other students unaided into the regular classroom in a way that would disrupt everyone else's education. Martin states,"What LDA seeks is proper consideration for every child of appropriate services in the least restrictive environment." That is clearly supported by the courts.

Evans (1990) does point out that regular classroom teachers may need to develop a greater understanding of disabled students, particularly the behavior and academic problems that set them apart. Pre-referral Consultation will require training for all the staff. Consultants may also need additional skill in presenting interventions in supporting teacher change. Parent education is also an

important component of introducing in-classroom interventions. Families are able to reinforce appropriate study behavior at home and monitor on-going classroom instruction.

Evans also describes several reasons why such practices of Pre-referral Consultation can fail. Many innovations are couched in inflated promises by persons not familiar with day-to-day classroom and school realities. Parental rights are overemphasized, with families believing that general education placement is a panacea for all their difficulties. In addition, the general education environment already severely taxes the ingenuity of instructors Evans discusses as the reality.

To expect the classroom teacher alone to meet all the needs of 30 or more children is unrealistic. How much longer can this teacher help all the at-risk "kids" by tailoring the curriculum for these children as well as those mainstreamed who are handicapped? What happens of course is that teachers burn out discusses Peck (1988). Therefore, a team approach to assist teachers is the only answer. Providing the perfect program for the at-risk children such as those who may lack experience, needs more than what one teacher can give. They may be the latchkey children from homes where both parents work. Maybe there is only one parent too weary from a hard day's work to do more. Some children are disadvantaged because they lack exposure to the world. Maybe they simply lack stimulation. There are also those children who have allergies, are born premature, or children who have

other medical problems that keep them from maturing at the same rate as other children their age.

There is a unique approach to helping at-risk students in grades K-5 in the Moore School District in Oklahoma. Here a pull-out program entitled, School To Aid Youth (STAY), works with 40 first grade students each year. There are two teachers and two aides who conduct two sessions each day for classes of 20 students. They give one-on-one intervention. That is hard to imagine! But their approach is to build self-esteem and confidence because they believe that is the key to learning. The writer agrees totally. If a child feels good about what he/she can do, this child can't help but succeed. The saying, "Success Breeds Success" couldn't be more true here. The students are those who score at, or below, the 40th percentile on the Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test administered at the end of kindergarten. These students are given a year-long remedial program. They receive 90 minutes of Math and 90 minutes of reading instruction each day with a group of 20 evenly divided. These children do meet success and parents approve wholeheartedly in the Project STAY Program says Peck (1989).

From the Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students their mission is to significantly improve the education of disadvantaged students at each level of schooling through new knowledge and practices produced by thorough scientific study and evaluation. The center's Early and Elementary Education Program is working to develop,

evaluate, and disseminate instructional programs capable of bringing disadvantaged students to high levels of achievement, particularly in the fundamental areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. The goal is to expand the range of effective alternatives which school may use under Chapter 1 and other compensatory education funding, etc.

The Language Minority Program according to Slavin and Yampolsky (1991) is a program that represents a collaborative effort through a number of university settings. The goal of the program is to identify, develop, and evaluate effective programs for disadvantaged Hispanic, American Indian, Southeast Asian, and other language minority children.

"The School, Family, and Community Connections Program focuses on the key connections between schools and families and between schools and communities to build better educational program for disadvantaged children and youth. Initial work is seeking to provide a research base concerning the most effective ways for schools to interact with and assist parents of disadvantaged students and interact with the community to produce effective community involvement" (Slavin & Yampolsky, 1991, p. 5)

"Children labeled 'at-risk' are targeted for special attention in most school systems, but programs specifically focused on their needs rarely have been measured objectively for effectiveness" (Rawson & Rawson, 1993, p. 26).

"What can be done with the students who are the talk of

the teacher's lounge; the students who make even the most devoted teacher feel defeated; the students who tell you they hate school and mean it; the students who don't do anything even remotely academic if they can possibly avoid it; the students who don't like anybody, but most of all don't like themselves?" asks the Rawsons. This is a challenge!

Unfortunately, these same questions keep coming up in trying to come up with programs for the at-risk youngsters. How does anyone save the child's self-esteem when that child keeps feeding himself negative input? He is convinced he is a failure. It may take a really innovative change--total change of scene away from the regular school setting. This is what Rawson and Rawson found, but most educators do not have that opportunity. Therefore, could it be possible to change the approach to learning so dramatically that the student actually finds success?

The challenge might be in a summer program that has more flexibility for innovation. "Kids" just might be "tricked" into learning. How is that possible? Well, the Rawsons did just that with setting up a new environment that is structured for learning, but doesn't remind these kids of school. The Rawsons' wanted a place where the kids' reputations wouldn't lead them to behavioral expectations, where they were able to get away temporarily from their home communities and parents to gain a little perspective on their identity and where they were headed.

The Rawsons' also wanted these at-risk youngsters to

have a totally different type of teacher, curriculum, classroom materials and evaluation system that somehow could be perceived as better, but, if that isn't possible, at least very different! What a challenge indeed, but when evaluating the merit, it is worth considering or at least something educationally that is as innovative.

Schools with at-risk students can transform themselves into vital places where kids, teachers and parents want to be. Brandt (1992) discusses Levin, a Stanford professor of education and of economics.

"Levin's educational vision is to accelerate the learning of disadvantaged children--to bring at-risk students into the academic mainstream by the end of their elementary school years" (Brandt, 1992, p. 19).

Levin has developed the cost-effective Accelerated Schools model. This model is different from some other programs for at-risk students because of the belief in the teaching-learning approach that works best for at-risk kids. This is a "gifted and talented" strategy rather than a remedial approach. Find the strengths in the students and the teachers as well. Levin says, "I am convinced that if we exposed all children to the richest experiences--but also connected schools, Dewey-style, with the children's experiences, their culture, and their community--we could bring kids into the mainstream."

The belief of reinforcing positive expectations begins to change attitudes in the staff and the parents.

Just a simple addition to the age old "Back-to-School Night" by adding to the notice that there will be a short presentation on How to Help Your Child Succeed with Homework brought in 175 parents compared to the previous year of 17. This was in a school with 600 kids, 90 percent minority, and very poor. When there are high expectations for parents, parents like students will come through and show their interest they do have in their children succeeding in life.

Teachers can't help but agree that parents do love their children and parents do want the best for them.

CHAPTER III

Anticipated Outcomes and Evaluation Instruments

Goals and Expectations

The following goals and expected outcomes were projected for this practicum.

The overall goal of prevention of school failure through an early intervention program and success experiences for at-risk students kindergarten through grade 3 will be to identify and implement a developmentally appropriate program to assist these students.

These students at-risk are mainly Chapter 1, NEP, LEP and students in Special Education and mainstreamed, or are referrals to the Student Study Team with language arts skills deficiencies, who require success experiences through developmentally appropriate instruction.

The additional goals of this practicum were:

To improve interventions and provide services to students at-risk avoiding retention as one solution to the problem.

To provide diagnostic assessment and developmentally appropriate language arts curriculum for the early

intervention program for at-risk children in kindergarten through grades three.

To provide parent involvement strategies for the Chapher 1, Bilingual and Special Education programs and other at-risk student parents at the writer's school as a model for the district.

Expected Outcomes

By the end of the implementation period, when queried about the six parent involvement/education issues identified earlier, the 10 primary teachers and resource specialist teacher will indicate that all six issues will have been effectively addressed (see Appendix A & F).

By the end of the implementation period, when queried about the six literacy issues identified earlier, the 10 primary teachers and resource specialist teacher will indiate that at least four of these have been effectively addressed (see Appendix A & F).

By the end of the implementation period, developmentally appropriate Language Arts curriculum will be established by the writer, district curriculum director and early intervention team for at-risk kindergarten through grade 3 students as measured by the completed Early Intervention Curriculum Handbook.

By the end of the implementation period, the Extended

Day Team and Extended Day bilingual aides will be trained in the use of the Early Intervention Curriculum Handbook and Early Intervention for School Success (EISS) Continuum diagnostic assessment tool as measured by the inservice record of attendance.

By the end of the implementation period, identified at-risk students participating in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program, will show improvement from the pre-EISS Continuum diagnostic assessment tool (see Appendix E) to the post-EISS Continuum of at least one developmental level in each of the areas of listening, speaking, writing and reading or through diagnostic authentic assessment (i.e., Portfolios, tape recordings and anecdotal records).

By June 30, 1993, the writer's district specialist will post-test at school year end the at-risk population pre-tested as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised with 75% of this population showing 8 months growth.

By June 30, 1993, 10 primary teachers involved in this practicum will demonstrate 20% more positive responses in a post survey (see Appendix A & F) asking their perceptions of early intervention services to what was being provided from a similar survey completed in October of 1992.

By June 30, 1993, the writer will pre and post survey (see Appendix C & D) the parents/primary students involved in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program, twice weekly

for 45 minute periods, if since implementation of this program are observed any positive changes in their child's oral language and emergent literacy, (i.e., listening, speaking, writing and reading) as measured by a 20% or more increase in positive responses.

By June 30, 1993, the 10 primary teachers involved in the practicum will be able to identify and tell about at least one article in the literature provided in the handbook that they found to be particularly meaningful in bringing about changes in instructional practices or their perceptions of at-risk young children.

Measurement Outcomes

The success of the Extended Day Early Intervention Program provided for at-risk youngsters in kindergarten through grade three was to be measured according to the outcomes expected. Any additional data from the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS), the grade 1 to 6 school-wide achievement test used to qualify students below the 35th percentile for Chapter 1, would be included if significant. Also the K-1 Checklist that is used in kindergarten and be-before the end of a child's first year in grade one to qualify for Chapter 1.

The writer's expectations of the Extended Day Team, the teachers for the program, was to be shown through the pre and post questionnaire. The same was to be true of the parents' and students' pre and post questionnaire indicating

how the students "feel" about their success. Further, for the students the writer's expectations were to be in their language arts skills growth while in the at-risk program. This was to be measured by the standardized test as well as the EISS continuum or the authentic assessment of Portfolios or whatever else the teachers collected of work samples.

The six literacy issues identified by the Extended Day Program Team, which included primary teachers and resource specialist, were to identify that at least four would have been effectively addressed through the Extended Day Early Intervention Program. In addition, six parent involvement/ education issues were to be addressed by the writer after implementation of the Chapter 1 Home-School Partnership monthly workshops in which all parents of the school were to be invited, including those with children at-risk. The writer and bilingual aide were trained to become district trainers by the Home-School Partnership State Trainers in summer, 1992. This was sponsored by the writer's district.

Developmentally appropriate Language Arts curriculum for the K-3 at risk students was to be researched and determined by the writer, district curriculum director and early intervention team. This curriculum found to be developmentally appropriate was to be put into a handbook for use in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program. Also, there was to be scheduled at least one inservice training given by the writer and follow-up for the team and aides in the use of the Early Intervention Curriculum Handbook developed and

Early Intervention for School Success (EISS) Continuum that was to be provided by the writer.

The continuum was developed by the EISS trainers in a 1992 summer retraining in which the writer then became a state trainer, as well as already a district trainer since 1989. In 1988, an EISS grant was co-written by the writer, but not implemented by new administration. The district did not sponsor this updated training as it was obtained by the writer through a scholarship process from EISS. The writer considers EISS a valid "Early Intervention for School Success." After the training was completed, the principal/director of curriculum was impressed by the data and other material collected by the writer. This was put to use in the pending development of an Early Intervention Curriculum Handbook at the onset of this practicum implementation.

Mechanism for Recording Unexpected Events

A log was used by the writer during the implementation period to record any unexpected events. The use of anecdotal records for the students was extremely helpful in recording student progress, concerns, or any other notations for diagnostic purposes. Portfolio assessment was used by only one of the members of the Early Intervention Team. Other members simply collected samples of at-risk student work. In addition, only one, the writer, used the EISS continuum.

Description of Plans for Analyzing Results

One of the means of analyzing results of the Extended Day Early Intervention Program was to compare the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) given to the entire school population first through sixth grade in English or Spanish in May yearly. The scores would be compared to the Chapter 1 students who have had the benefit of the Extended Day Early Intervention Program and those who have not and if significant would be graphed.

Another plan to analyze results of this program was for those students who have been referred to the Student Study Team because the extended day was viewed as an early intervention. If the teacher of the student saw adequate progress, it would not be necessary to continue the referral to the formal level.

There would also be the opportunity to look at the third grade Chapter 1 NEP/LEP students that the writer was working with to determine if there was improvement on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test from pre to post test. The Language Assessment Scale (LAS) was given to all NEP/LEP students at year end in English and Spanish. The Extended Day Early Intervention Program LEP students would be evaluated as to the progress which would be compared to the previous year's scores and separately recorded. The writer was to graph the results if significant. A video recording could be used for observation purposes of the students involved in the program.

In addition, any other reports provided by the classroom teachers (e.g., quarterly report cards) would be screened and compared for all students in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program to the previous report at the beginning of the year.

Parent Conferences in May with the classroom teachers of the Extended Day Early Intervention Program at-risk students would also be a part of the evaluation process by the writer. On the last day of the Extended Day Early Intervention Program the parents were invited to attend to discuss anything about their child's progress over the school year. Any parents who did not complete a post-survey were asked to do so. This final day ended the program on a "high note."

CHAPTER IV

SOLUTION STRATEGIES

Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions

The problem is early intervention services for at-risk children are not adequate or effective and retention is still inappropriately viewed by some parents and educators as one solution to addressing the educational needs of students at-risk.

Chapter 1, NEP/LEP, Special Education and other at-risk students who are experiencing academic problems, which may be caused by a variety of factors, lack an early intervention program with developmentally age appropriate curriculum and diagnostic assessment techniques plus parent involvement strategies. These disadvantaged students with special needs are from preschool/kindergarten age through grade three and often even further into the intermediate grades.

Solutions Suggested by the Literature

Twelve recommendations from the School Readiness Task Force Report (1988) are: 1) An appropriate, integrated, experiential curriculum should be provided for children ages four through six. 2) Class size should be reduced. 3)

Programs should meet the special needs of our culturally and linguistically diverse students. 4) Classroom organization and teaching methods should reflect the heterogeneous skills and abilities of the children in the early primary program. 5) The staff of the early primary programs should receive appropriate education, training, and renumeration. 6) Full-day programs should be an option for children ages four through six. 7) Programs should provide either before or after school child care or links with child development programs for children who need this care. 8) Assessment methods for children in early primary programs should be drastically altered. 9) Funding and support must be made available for the early primary programs. 10) Facilities should be rebuilt or remodeled to meet the needs of early primary programs. 11) Parental involvement should be encouraged. 12) A public awareness campaign should be launched describing appropriate learning practices for children ages four through six.

Mitchell (1989) discusses principles to guide the development of policy for early childhood programs which are the overall quality of the programs and the continuity and comprehensiveness of the services. She presents a view of the early childhood system that will help move those involved toward "an integrated view of early childhood" (Mitchell, 1989, p. 665).

What Mitchell means by an integrated view of early childhood is that child care and early education cannot be

separated. Programs for young children provides both care and education. These two functions are bound together because children cannot be well cared for without learning from the caregivers; children cannot be educated well without being properly cared for. Early childhood education is probably the most prevalent form of education experienced by young children today. However, it is called child care.

Previously early education was focused primarily on Head Start programs from public funds. The remainder of preschool programs were funded privately to be provided for only those children whose families could afford their cost. In some large urban school districts, Chapter 1 funds were, but not often, spent on prekindergarten children. In the Education for All Handicapped Act (P.L. 94-142) and more recently through P.L. 99-457 there have been and are presently preschool provisions for the handicapped. However, over the last decade federal support for early childhood programs has almost diminished in funding with a few exceptions. Two bills that did pass include provisions dealing with early education and care which are: the Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 (reauthorization of Chapter 1) and the Family Support Act of 1988. The first was the new Even Start, a joint parent-child education program and the second changed the rules for receipt of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Parents of children older than 3 must work or attend job-training. With this requirement was created an uncapped fund to pay for their

child care. The 1980's put children under 5 into the national spotlight with the Bush Administration's interest in and support for Head Start.

Public schools must become partners and sharing the responsibility for making high quality early education readily available and accessible.

The Elementary Grades Task Force Report (1992) identifies and discusses the importance of the most critical years of a child's educational development. The previous School Readiness Task Force Report is one document that helped provoke reform of early childhood and middle grades education. "The years from kindergarten through grade six are a time of uninhibited wonder, enthusiasm for leaning, and breathtakingly rapid growth. The social, emotional, physical and intellectual identities children construct for themselves during this period go a long way toward determining the subsequent trajectories of their lives" (Elementary Grades Task Force Report, 1992, p. xi). This group shared two beliefs about elementary education which were that all children can learn and that good schools make a tremendous difference in ensuing that students do learn. They discussed the current learning theory in detail. The report states that the language arts curriculum should be organized around the great literary works.

"A steady diet of literature from the earliest years can provide the child with significant content through which the language competencies of listening, speaking, reading,

and writing can be developed in an integrated and meaning centered fashion" (Elementary Grades Task Force Report, 1992, p. 4). The term "Initial Literacy" was used in the report referring to how in the early grades the dominant mode of reading instruction has been phonics, but now it is steeped in authentic language of the literature even in the early grades.

Hall (1992) provides the reader a similar term to "Initial Literacy" which comes another term, "Emergent Literacy." Hall says the word emergent is useful on four counts. First, it implies that development takes place from within the child. Even though people may inform children about many aspects of literacy, responsibility for making sense of all the data rests with the child. Therefore, instruction is not the only means of encouraging the emergence of literacy. Secondly, emergence is a gradual process: it takes place over time. Thirdly, for something to emerge, there has to be something there in the first place. Where emergent literacy is concerned this means the fundamental abilities children have, and use, to make sense of the world. Fourthly, things usually only emerge if conditions are right. The context must provide opportunities for engagement in real literacy tasks.

Sulzby (1990) clearly outlines why children's story-writing is so important particularly for kindergartners. She answers the question about what is this new term of "Emergent Literacy" and includes "Emergent Writing." The

first term is defined as literacy development that begins long before children start formal instruction. Children use legitimate reading and writing behaviors in the informal settings of home and community. The search for skills which predict subsequent achievement has been misconceived. Literacy development is the appropriate way to describe what was called reading readiness: The child develops as a writer/reader. The notion of reading preceding writing, or vice-versa, is a misconception. Listening, speaking, reading, and writing abilities (as aspects of language--both oral and written) develop concurrently and interrelatedly, not sequentially. Children develop these aspects of language at different rates and therefore, at different stages of their early oral and written language development.

Strickland (1990) gives new insights into how children learn to read and write which are changing dramatically what is now referred to as the teaching of literacy. She makes four points about the study of literacy: 1) Learning to read and write begins early in life and is ongoing. 2) Learning to read and write are interrelated processes that develop in concert with oral language. 3) Learning to read and write requires active participation in activities that have meaning in the child's daily life. 4) Learning to read and write is particularly enhanced by shared book experiences.

Strickland further points out that literacy is no longer regarded as simply a cognitive skill but as a complex

activity with social, linguistic, and psychological aspects. Issues for instruction are those related to the place of writing and invented spelling. Educators must be careful not to give parents the impression that skills are not important as invented spelling or even scribbling is allowed. Parents need to understand how literacy emerges and that the integration of assessment and instruction is fundamental to an emergent literacy perspective.

Strickland reminds educators that increased reliance on systematic observation, record keeping, and analysis of children's classroom participation and work products and less reliance on standardized tests are the hallmarks of student evaluation and teacher planning. Therefore, the child be graded more authentically. Maybe even report grade cards as known now could become something of the past.

The Parent Teacher Association has learned that some parents over react to poor grades on report cards reports Kuersten (1987). There are children who are afraid to take their grades home because of the reactions of their parents they believe are forthcoming. Some parents are too severe--even abusive. Houston's Children's Protective Services Agency have reported to the Greater Houston Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse that their work load increases at report card time. This agency found that verbal as well as emotional abuse was common and that usually the abuse was perpetrated by the female parent because she was the one who saw their child's grades first.

A juvenile officer with the Houston Police Department found that the reports of runaway and missing children increased when report cards came due. The department was led to believe that report card time was a very stressful time in every family.

As a follow-up this city ran public service ads in the Houston Chronicle to correspond with report time for the Houston Independent School District. The ad consisted of six points to advise parents which were the following: sit down with the child and review the report card, praise the child, be calm, ask how you can help him or her do better, ask what the child can do to make better grades, and make a plan with the teacher and the child to help him or her do better. The same ad ran in the various Spanish language newspapers in the county writes Kuersten. The campaign has been picked up by other school districts outside of Houston around the country. Other PTA's are invited to obtain free information from the Greater Houston Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse, 4151 Southwest Freeway, Suite 435, Houston, TX 77027.

To concur with the beliefs of others more recently in the literature, Glogau and Fessel (1967) describe an actual non-graded primary school in its first year of operation. It would be an invaluable guide to other schools considering a non-graded program on the primary level in instituting a plan of the logistics of such a program.

While Smith (1970) wrote how to provide a step by step teaching guide for the entire non-graded program. This

guidebook gives the teacher a day-by-day program for developing and conducting activities in the non-graded school showing how to provide individualized instruction. Smith describes how to use a variety of learning centers, how to record and evaluate progress, how to run the group sessions, how to organize materials and just about whatever else is needed to implement a non-graded program in a non-graded elementary school. If more schools considered this option, there would be no retention.

Researchers are also now connecting retention and the impact it has on the student's self-esteem as being tied to the dropout problem. Natale (1991) shares what a principal at a 1,200 student school is doing with students whose academic or emotional problems put them at-risk of failing a grade. This principal, Hector Montenegro, requires the students to attend an after-school tutoring program. He firmly believes that only on rare occasions does retention make a difference; the majority of time it is demoralizing and disruptive and results in dropouts. Research points to retention's deficiencies, but some school systems are slow in abandoning the practice.

There is a myth that youngsters should be ready and able to do whatever teachers ask them at any grade whether they are developmentally ready or not. Educators should be able to take youngsters where they are and move them along to where they ought to be. The question is asked if there should be specific guidelines about retention policy. The

answer is that no one should become so ironclad in one direction or the other regarding retention. It must be looked upon carefully, but not necessarily abandoned all together. Each case should be viewed considering the entire individual and situation rather than any ironclad decisions automatically. Even the transition classes have lost favor even though the intention was to hold off school failure for the kindergartner or first grader. With a developmentally appropriate curriculum, there is less need to consider the transitional classes as being the answer to helping youngsters who are developmentally immature.

Are there two more R's in the school picture? Readiness and retention were "combed carefully" in a recent news article. Fetbrandt (1992) discusses the right age for starting school and whether to make a child repeat a grade. Little in education is more hotly debated. Although there are literally volumes of research that point to the contrary regarding youngsters who are retained in a grade for another year. There is the likelihood of low self-esteem, discipline problems, poor academic achievement and significantly increased chances of dropping out of high school.

Fetbrandt further discusses a national study on retention that found that 11.7 percent of all kindergarten children were held back in 1990-91. Districts who use transitional classes (i.e., prekindergarten, pre-first or pre-second grade) are just stepping stones to the next grade level as they are viewed as retention. Therefore, the chil-

dren become "at-risk."

So what is meant by "at-risk" and how are "at-risk" children identified? Day and Anderson (1992) attempt to answer this question. They say the term "at-risk" is widely used, and yet with no conformity. Students with normal intelligence but who are failing to achieve the basic skills necessary for success in school and in life, is one comprehensive definition. It can be said that at-risk children are most likely to be those students identified to receive special or compensatory education. In the United States there are two programs that address the at-risk student problem. Head Start is the one preschool program that attempts to help low income children; however, it reaches only 400,000 children each year, Day and Anderson remind us. They give these statistics that are alarming. "Among all American children, one in five is poor. By the year 2000 it is estimated that one in four children will live in poverty" (Day & Anderson, 1992, p. 6).

These same authors report that the Title I/Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, organized in 1965, was the other federal program designed specifically to address the needs of the poor. In 1991-92 this program increased to 6.2 billion dollars. This decade brings us a new document from the United States Department of Education which is entitled, America 2000: An Education Strategy. Its own description reads: America 2000 is a national strategy, not a federal program. It honors local control, relies on

local initiative, affirms states and localities as the senior partners....It recognizes real education reform happens community by community and school by school. There is no mention in this document though of the real challenge that faces educators today and that is the sensitivity needed to various ethnic groups, but especially to those with English as a Second Language. Additionally, the needs of children with physical and emotional handicaps present an ongoing challenge to educators. There will be an increasing number of special-needs or at-risk children in the classrooms well before the year 2000. Therefore, educators must begin to meet these challenges.

Understanding More of the Special Needs or At-Risk Children

Harry (1992) reports theories of the problem of low income Puerto Rican parents whose children were classified as learning disabled or mildly mentally retarded. These parents views were concurrent with arguments against labeling as well as the debate on appropriate assessment and instruction of culturally and linguistic minority students which includes English-only instruction.

The primary aim of this study was to examine the role of culture of parents' interpretations of their children's special education placement. A secondary aim was to examine the extent and quality of the parents' interpretations of their children's special education placement. There is continuing concern for more appropriate and effective methods

of assessment and instruction for culturally and linguistic minority students. "For many minority students, underachievement is the point at which regular and special education meet, with many students from what been called the 'mental withdrawal--grade retention--drop-out syndrome' (Stein, 1986), crossing the border from 'normalcy' to 'disability'" (Harry, 1992, p. 29).

This study by Harry indicates that there is an additional dimension to the literature on Hispanic families' interaction with special education by seeking parents actual definitions of disability, as well as their interactions to their experience of their children's classification and placement in special education programs. The study further "shows that such parents can be very perceptive about their children's difficulties and, therefore, have a great deal to contribute to an effective parent professional partnership" (p. 29).

"Too many Spanish-speaking youngsters, recently arrived in this country and unfamiliar with the language, are placed in school programs where they are destined to fail. Because these youngsters have not learned English, they fall behind in reading, math, science, and other areas. They are placed in resource rooms and labeled "learning disabled." Case histories from schools on the U.S. Mexico border were somewhat similar and showed repeated patterns of language, cultural, economic, and educational differences" (Ainsa, 1984, p.105). The writer identifies with the above findings with students

placed in the Resource Specialist Program as learning disabled. Instead, after helping these students obtain the language of the land--they were no longer "learning disabled." However, this is another case for the "at-risk" category.

Additionally, there is often an undetected special need with children who are abused--any kind of abuse--physical, sexual, neglect and emotional, explores Maher (1989). Of course the most common kinds of abuse known by educators are physical and sexual because they are the most extreme. Yet what about the emotional abuse some children suffer from on a daily basis even though it may not be so obvious? Neglect may or may be so clear. There are children who come to school with a sense of worthlessness. Some children bring this burden to school along with their sense of trust in adults having been broken. Teachers may wonder why a child doesn't respond to the stimulus offered or even after some signs of progress, will fall back into the frozen state of distrust. The type of neglect that has to do with the poor hygiene or nutrition state of the child is easier for the teacher to recognize. It is also easier for the teacher to discuss this with the school nurse for assistance with the child and parents. But all types of abuse will affect the child's learning and educators are responsible to make the effort to help improve or change the at-risk status of any child involved in these circumstances.

Why is the responsibility with the educators? This question is often asked discusses Maher. The three different

elements to the reply are: 1) Teachers and schools already refer 35% of the cases reported to the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. 2) Teachers have the training which enables them to understand what constitutes normal and abnormal growth and development in children. Child abuse results in abnormal growth and development. 3) The greatest proportion of abuse takes place within or close to the family. Therefore, when a child needs to talk to someone and seeks help, it is often quite difficult for the child to turn to family members. The teacher is the first responsible adult the child comes in contact and seen to be "in loco parentis."

The likely extent of the problem is much greater than is thought, but it is important to realize that those names which reach child abuse registers constitute only a very small proportion of those who are abused. There is no accurate idea of the prevalence. Estimates far exceed the known cases in schools. "This seems to reinforce the impression that substantial numbers of abused students go through school without their teacher's knowledge. How many of these children have other explanations assigned to their apparently unusual development? How many children in special classes, units and schools are there as a result of misdiagnosis? In how many such cases have we been unaware of a background of abuse?" (Maher, 1989, p. 13).

Some other statistics given in a Scripsit Booklet (1987) provided free by the county alcohol abuse division,

states that each year in the U.S. about one million children are abused or neglected. Who is the most likely to abuse? The answer is a parent or other adult responsible for the care of children all ages from families of any racial or ethnic group, religion, income level or educational background and from any city, suburb or farm. Alcohol plays a major role in the abuse or neglect of children. Alcohol, child abuse and neglect are related because either alcohol use may cause abuse and neglect or alcohol use may provide an excuse for abuse. There is often much in common between problem drinkers and adults who abuse or neglect children. Examples may be that they have low self-esteem, be emotionally immature, refuse to take responsibility for their behavior, be socially isolated and have parents who had drinking problems or who abused or neglected them. Children are affected in an especially harmful way. They may be: insecure, overly responsible, unable to trust others and express feelings. If these children are also abused or neglected, the impact is greater still. Possible reasons for abuse are: the drinking parent may "lose control", the non-drinking parent may take his or her resentment of the drinking parent out on the child, or either parent may have unrealistic ideas about what to expect from a child at a given age.

Teachers often will see the signs of abuse or neglect in children by the following: Depression, Aggressiveness, Passiveness, Sleeping Problems, Repeated Injuries, Neglected Appearance, Physical Problems, A reluctance to go home,

Constant attention seeking or Repeated Truancy. An abusive or neglectful parent may appear to be: immature, impulsive, overly critical, overly strict, isolated, a "loner", apathetic, distrustful and lacking in self-esteem. Therefore, help is needed and teachers are the most likely to be able to get help for the family.

Teachers are also finding more ill students. Obviously sickness would hinder children's school performance. Dart (1992) reports more children are coming to grade school sick, disturbed or abused, a national survey of teachers showed. Dr. Daniel Shea, president of the American Academy of Pediatrics said, "This country has a health care crisis in the classroom."

In the survey nine out of ten teachers said they had at least one student last year whose emotional or physical health problems had hindered their classroom performance. "Most teachers said some children at their schools suffered from psychological and emotional problems, family violence and abuse, unhealthy lifestyles, poor nutrition, violent behavior and lack of regular health care. Nearly half the teachers reported having students suffering from untreated illnesses or problems with vision or hearing" (Dart, 1992, p. A-1).

Looking at Developmentally, Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Program Models K-3

In beginning to consider High/Scope's active learning

approach to K-3 education, the writer looked to Weikart (1989) who originated the Perry Preschool Study in the 1960's, one of the first long-term evaluations of preschool programs. He is spearheading research and curriculum projects at High/Scope. "What we know from the Perry study is that a high quality preschool can double the disadvantaged child's chances for a better life, which means the child is more likely as a teen to graduate from high school, begin higher education and obtain and keep a job. We know that high-quality preschool programs can reduce personal and social problems for almost half. They reduce the placement in special education classes, reduce arrest rates, reduce teen pregnancy rates, and reduce welfare dependency" (Weikart, 1989, p. 12-13).

In an update of High/Scope's K-3 curriculum, Hohmann (1989) reports that K-3 educators need to be provided with the tools, training, and support materials needed to bring effective developmental practices to K-3 programs in standard public school settings. Yet developmental programs are not new to public schools. Three factors in particular stimulated an interest in this growing trend. To quote these factors accurately, the writer will use the words of Hohmann: 1. More and more, there is recognition that many current elementary school programs, although designed to address the needs of at-risk children, are not significantly altering their school failure rates. 2. There is widespread recognition of the success of innovators (High/Scope and

others) who have demonstrated the long-term, beneficial effects of pre-K developmental programs for children at-risk of school failure and the social problems accompanying such failure. 3. The public's increased awareness of and commitment to providing good early education for children has magnified the discrepancies between effective and ineffective approaches to educating at-risk youngsters. It's clearer now than ever before that developmentally appropriate pre-K practices produce good results for at-risk youngsters. We want to be able to say the same about typical early elementary practices. Hohmann restates in his update that not only should we target K-3 children at risk of school failure, but we should also realize that all youngsters would benefit by participating in developmentally based programs.

Focusing on age appropriate curriculum in some most recent literature, the writer's efforts have been substantiated in teaching handwriting skills to children with special needs. Viadero (1993) discusses the rarity of teaching penmanship or handwriting, at least not past the second or third grade. So, why bother worrying about it? The writer has found if children are not given instruction in how to form their letters, they too often devise their own methods which are more difficult than teaching them D'Nealian handwriting. If they learn to shape their letters using D'Nealian from kindergarten through grade two, by the third grade they can move easily and successfully into cursive writing.

Substantial research also continues to support teaching

language-minority children in their native language and suggests that bilingualism is a cognitive asset according to Hakuta and Gould (1987). Students in New Haven's program learn a variety of skills in Spanish while preparing to enter all-English classes. The approach is based on research indicating that a strong native-language foundation makes learning English easier and faster.

The writer continues to research material of past and new workshops/conferences and further literature reviews from education journals, along with the latest research from the state and federal departments of education on elementary programs to help at-risk children. Also, the professional journals keep stressing Chapter 1 programs can work and Bilingual/ESL programs can provide the necessary help to non-English and limited English proficient students through the trained bilingual teachers and instructional assistants on staff. In addition, to train other personnel in early education and bilingual theory and practice by personnel belonging to early childhood or bilingual professional organizations and with the necessary background and certification. These sources provide opportunities to learn from the experiences of other professionals in these fields who have found workable solutions to helping at-risk students, and the earlier, the better it is for these children.

Other Ideas Explored and Evaluated

The Teacher Needs Survey Regarding "At-Risk" Student

Services (see Addendum B) contained ten questions of yes or no with spaces for responses or elaborations to questions which were as follows:

1. Ten teachers checked "no" they did not agree services for Chapter 1 students was adequate from kindergarten through grade 3, while two upper grade teachers replied "yes."

   Comments to Question #1 were:

   Services in some classes and some grade levels are coordinated better than at others. Services provided with aide time for small group/1 on 1 instruction, materials and inservices to train personnel can be an improve.

   It is too hard to give an opinion on whether services are improved when there is only Chapter 1 Aide time in lower grades at present.

   Define adequate. Let's go for excellence!

2. Nine teachers checked "yes" they do agree services for Chapter 1 students should be provided beyond third grade. One said "no", two said "don't know" or no answer at all.

   Comments to Question #2 were:

   I think Chapter 1 should be provided to K-6. Hire more aides to work with Chapter 1 or new students who are 4-6, and kids from our school who are still Chapter 1 who started here in K-3. In other words, they still deserve Chapter 1 because they may not have had enough help.

   I feel if there is still a need for Chapter 1 service beyond third grade, then service should be provided.

   Yes, we need smaller classes.

   Sure, if funds are available!

3. Nine teachers checked "no" that they were not satisfied with the services being provided to the non-English proficient (NEP) and limited English proficient (LEP) students in kindergarten through grade three. One said "yes" while one said, "can't answer this question, and one said, "unknown to me what services they have presently."

   Need ESL pull-out in afternoons.

   Students need more instruction in primary language. Need teachers/aides trained in bilingual teaching methods.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Need more help for teachers in terms of "How to teach LEP and NEP in any grade level."

Need more support from Spanish literate aides.

Service is better than in past because of clustering and more trained teachers. But we have a long way to go!

The one who said, yes, responded to "please explain what is your primary satisfactionm you see for your student(s) now or in the past?" This is an upper grade teacher who wrote: "The demonstrated progress of LEP students in years past."

4. Seven teachers checked "no" to not being satisfied with NEP and LEP services grades four through six. Four teachers checked "yes" to being satisfied while one did not respond at all.

Comments to Question #4 were:

No responses:
It would be nice if they had smaller group settings.

Need more textbooks in primary language and ESL.

Need more beginning set of English books of interest to upper graders.

Yes responses:
Perfect time frame re: time out is class balanced with their needs - excellent personnel!

Pull-outs - "teachers"--(aides) with ESL abilities, but I don't teach upper-grades, just what I hear about aides.

5. Six teachers checked "no" to question regarding satisfaction with Student Study Team referral process. Three did check "yes" and three wrote "yes" and "no."

Comments to Question #5:

No responses:
Testing needs to happen sooner.

More attention needs to be made to LEPs - not a "We can't provide services - so why test?" attitude by one on team.

Team should agree to testing even though the child may have trouble emotionally or with absences.

I feel it takes too long for any action to take place. Speed up the process!

Better suggestions of how to help the children - ideas for daily use.

Yes and no responses:
Yes and no - it does take a long time, but I'm sure that is the nature of the "beast."

The team is great! Very helpful and supportive, etc.
The "system" takes too long. Kids need to be tested! Now-not next year, etc. Heavy burden on teachers.

Brings parents on board as a partner-allows them to see a school-wide effort on behalf of their children.
The amount of paperwork is overwhelming sometimes-discourages SST.

Yes responses:
To get my one and only child referred, he was tested immediately??? Unfortunately, it took 1 year and some months to do that before I got him.

A sixth grader I had was referred in 1990 - was supported as a PAL by upper grade teachers 1991-92 - tested near grade level in 1992.

6. Five teachers checked "yes" to students being referred to Special Education whether they agree with time-line, placement, IEP team and referral process. Four teachers checked "no" while one was "yes and no" and two were not answered.

Comments to Question #6:

Yes responses:
There was only one I ever referred.

(Two teachers gave examples by naming students.)

No responses:
Sometimes I am not sure if the IEP is really addressing the needs of the student.
As the classroom teacher, I am not always consulted on what would be the best thing for that child.

A student in need never is given enough time. The process is too slow.

Sometimes I'm satisfied - sometimes not. I don't think tutoring services should be provided exclusively by an aide!

Yes and no response:
It takes a long time, but that's the law! I'm not sure.

7. Five teachers checked "yes" they had given some consideration to the non-graded primary concept, while five also checked "no" and two did not respond to the question.

   Comments to Question #7:

   Yes responses:
   I have read some about it. A report card is not very revealing of a child's actual developmental age level.

   Multi-age and Multi-level is being tried at our other school.

   No
   I don't like it!

8. Four teachers checked "yes" they did believe there was adequate early intervention for "at-risk" students, while five checked "no" and one "unknown" with one who only put question mark and another wrote, "I'm not sure."

   Comments to Question #8:

   Yes response:
   (one teacher gave name of student as example)

   No responses:
   More children need to be served in Headstart..

9. Four teachers checked "yes" it had been their experience to receive prior information regarding student(s) from Head Start or other sources of previous assessments or previous referrals from other teachers, while seven wrote "no" with comments and another wrote, "I'm upper grade."

   Comments to Question #9:

   Yes responses:
   Received info from (named teachers)

   Kindergarten teachers have given me much prior info.

   Teachers have shared information.

   Only by looking in the cum.

   No, but "would like" responses:
   A formalized, short synopsis of the preceding teacher's evaluation available as classes form in September.

   A one on one meeting with the previous teacher to set up a more positive approach. Going into a situation sometimes blindly can be hard for teacher and pupil.

I would rather start with little knowledge so I don't prejudge.

Need some form of assessment-early conferences did help to gain information.

Present system inadequate.

SST file or list of referrals should be readily available to anyone with concerns.

Cum file should be "red flagged" for students at-risk.

10. Ten teachers responded to recommendations to make changes in services for students "at-risk." They were as follows:

It seems that there is a barrier to getting special help for some kids that really need it. I haven't had that frustration, but have watched other teachers deal with that situation.

One on one instruction for at least 1 hr. a day for each child (Hey, you asked!)

Extended day tutoring, group counseling.

More individual time for students in the classroom.
Smaller class size.
Substitutes for aides.

Need more guidance (for student, family, teacher) from all administrative levels.

Try follow-up model adopted by (named teacher at other school in district) for reading.

Faster reaction time for SSTs and testing.

Help and support from administration down to parents and students (i.e., literacy programs for adults, ESL Programs about what parents can do with young children who will be here in a few years.

Programs need to be more coordinated.
Need more planning time with involved staff.

ESL pull-out for primary.
Intervention for LEP that is equivalent to that of English speakers.
More primary language instruction as needed.
More teachers and aides trained in ESL/bilingual.

In 1991-92 the district had a State Department Coordinated Compliance Review for all categorical programs (i.e., Chapter 1, LEP, Special Education) for which the school district was given these programs' categorical funds. For each program the district must follow specific guidelines to be in compliance. In some areas of compliance, a new look at how special needs services are being provided is necessary. This remedy of early intervention services is by law (P.L. 99-457) now necessary for the district to provide. The CCR found the district was not in compliance regarding primary language instruction for the NEP/LEP population. Therefore, more services for the above categorical programs would be a part of the "extended-day program" concept and this responds to the teachers' ideas of services that are not being given.

General educators have the responsibility for all students unless any of these students with special needs becomes qualified for special education. Only through the Student Study Team at present can a student with any special needs be identified. The writer could assist and support the general education teachers with students in the new "extended-day program" already attempted at the writer's school. An evaluation of the teacher's comments to the needs survey indicates there is much more that can be done to help the pupils, their parents, and their teachers.

If after an appropriate early intervention developmental program were in place through the second grade and even third grade, then and only then, would it probably be

necessary to refer a student for a full psychological and academic evaluation by the school psychologist and resource specialist teacher. The role of the writer at the pre-referral stage to the Student Study Team (SST) is to assist the staff with interventions as well as observations in the classrooms, and to assist these students in the early grades when they are experiencing school problems.

Non-identified students, those commonly called "at-risk," would benefit from the collaboration between general and special educators particularly in the primary grades where early intervention can make a difference. The master schedule where all categorical programs, computer lab, library, physical education, recess, lunches, etc. has to become a school wide venture to allow time for the early intervention in the primary classrooms during the school day.

Early intervention tutorial assistance could be available to at-risk students in the form of peer and crossage tutors or from the resource teacher/aide.

The writer ideally would meet informally each week with primary level teachers and/or mainstream teachers to assure continuity for the at-risk or special needs students. Time for meeting would become available whenever teachers are free or their instructional aide is available to take the class of students. This would occur as deemed necessary to better understand a particular child's needs when conferencing together with the teacher, or teacher and parent, or

teacher and student, or teacher, student and parent.

The process of change has already been attempted in the four week pilot, but the developmentally appropriate language arts curriculum and diagnostic assessment techniques were being identified through on-going research/practice.

An "Extended Day Team" was established first with those primary teachers willing to further pilot a new extended day service for a semester or to the end of the school year, 1992-93. The team met after school to discuss the previous pilot teacher survey and train for this year's program.

The "Extended Day Team" primary teachers, and those teachers referring students with special needs to the SST plus school principal and parents, as appropriate, have received literature articles researched by the writer that provided guidelines for early prevention of school failure and early intervention for school success.

Through written communication in English and Spanish, Parent Conferences and other school functions designed for parent involvement, parents were to be introduced to the concept of a new extended day service for Chapter 1 primary at-risk students. The School Site Council and Parent Advisory Committees and Teacher-Parent Club were to be included in the planning stage and updated periodically. Parent and community volunteers were also to be encouraged to participate in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program. In addition, parents whose children participated would be provided workshops monthly in English and Spanish through

the Home-School Partnership. All parents in the school would be invited even though this was funded through the Chapter 1 program.

Description and Justification for Solutions Selected

What was attempted:

In this "Grande Plan" of solutions for the writer's school "at-risk" population, there has been a pilot after school/extended day program put into place. However, after this pilot and the research following, the solutions included an appropriate Language Arts developmental curriculum and tools for diagnostic assessment, along with the parental involvement component that were each a part of the implementation process of this practicum.

The support of administration was initially sought by the writer. Adherence to the plan of action implemented was agreed to by the writer and principal/director of curriculum.

Teachers were hired by the district from the primary and special education staff for an Extended Day Early Intervention Program. These teachers were in-serviced in using developmentally appropriate curriculum design. The Extended Day Early Intervention Program was in session twice per week 45 minute session after school for at-risk youngsters K-3. Those teachers who referred students to SST for academic school-related problems were screened and placed in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program as an alternative to

a full battery assessment by the psychologist for possible placement in a special education program. If the youngster did not make the gains in academic achievement after the year of intervention, the Student Study Team would formally refer the student for psychological and academic assessment to determine if there was a learning disability or other related problems (e.g., ADD or ADHD).

Other students selected for the extended day program were those referred by their primary teachers who met the following criteria: Any student referred must be Chapter 1 and NEP/LEP designated or NEP/LEP only, not making adequate academic progress and lastly, any other at-risk Chapter 1 student who may also be in the Resource Specialist Program.

The teaching group was the "Extended Day Team." Again, the early intervention developmentally appropriate program ideally provided to all of these "at-risk" students was to meet their individual needs of oral language development, emergent literacy integrated with psychomotor, and social development. The program used was a combination of High Scope and Early Intervention for School Success (EISS) programs.

An in-service for all primary teachers on staff was the next step. Reviewing the literature with them was part of the process. They were given further information from the state department of education regarding early intervention. Each small group reported what they had gleaned to the whole group. Question and answer time was provided as to how

the group might approach the developmentally appropriate Language Arts curriculum. A Handbook was developed by the writer from the materials provided by EISS/High-Scope Programs. To elicit congeniality, the writer served refreshments during the in-service.

Developing an appropriate K-3 curriculum and purchasing additional materials needed was the challenge of the "Extended Day Team."

Other primary teachers not involved in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program were provided minimal assistance in their classrooms with pre-referral "at-risk" students. Students from K-3 could become more successful with the most appropriate developmental curriculum sought. The writer came to the primary classrooms mainly to observe these students "at-risk." The concept of Pre-referral Consultation was intended to be part of the Extended Day Early Intervention Program.

Procedures prior to implementation were:

The proposal was shared with the principal for his input and final approval because this involved more than just those students on the caseload of the writer in the Resource Specialist Program. Primary students in need of additional services were those who were at-risk, either being referred or having been referred to the SST or at the pre-referral intervention stage. In addition, there were those who were multi-funded Chapter 1, and NEP/LEP students whose present program or programs were not providing adequately to meet

their more diverse needs.

Letters in English and Spanish went home to parents informing them of how the Extended Day Early Intervention Program was being expanded from the pilot program to better meet the needs of their children in the Chapter 1 and NEP/LEP programs as well as others "at-risk."

A pre and post questionnaire was further developed and administered for the at-risk students which did include a letter to parents plus a survey for teachers. Parent conferences were scheduled to go over the parent letter of introduction and student questionnaire (see Appendix C & D).

A parent involvement program was implemented called Home-School Partnership that included explaining to parents what developmentally appropriate curriculum in the area of Language Arts would "look-like" while integrating psychomotor, and social skill development. This parent program to be provided was intended for not only Chapter 1 parents.

A twice weekly extended day schedule was developed whereby this 45 minute time period was planned, teacher directed instruction plus centers for student planning as is the focus in the High-Scope program.

Lesson plans were developed initially together with teachers in the "Extended Day Team." A bilingual "Extended Day aide" was negotiated for and volunteers solicited to work with teachers and students with non-English or limited-English students. During the hour weekly or half-hour twice weekly, particular attention was to be given to providing

primary language instruction to those students according to their diagnostic and other assessment instrument results.

Head Start preschool personnel were to be trained, if possible, in the assessment process determined for kindergarten through the primary grades. This was part of the "Grande Plan" in the writer's school's early education programs' early intervention preschool through grade three.

Curriculum using appropriate developmental principles, such as High-Scope, was shared with the team because High-Scope has already been implemented in the Head Start program.

Visitations to a district where early intervention programs were successful was attempted by the writer for other "Extended Day Team" members. However, the writer did train for the EISS Trainer certification and Home-School Partnership parent involvement training.

Report of Action Taken

Implementation began immediately during week 1 of the first month. The kick-off event was planned with the "Extended Day Team" of primary teachers. Letters were sent home to the Chapter 1 students' parents regarding the implementation of the new Extended Day Early Intervention Program for the school year for Chapter 1 and Chapter 1 NEP/LEP students. Extended Day Early Intervention Program students took the attitudinal pre-test during the two afternoons of the first week or were taken home for parents to assist them

(see Appendix C & D). The writer provided an inservice training on the weekly minimum day for the "Extended Day Team" primary staff. The Early Intervention for School Success (EISS) Language Arts curriculum and EISS Continuum were shared by the principal and writer. The writer planned with the "Extended Day Team" for the following week.

Through the Student Study Team, the writer did assist the at-risk students at the pre-referral stage. This Pre-referral Consultant aspect of the new program was addressed as an intervention before referring the "at-risk" student(s) to the SST. The parent was then assured that interventions have occurred by the regular classroom teacher with possible resource teacher assistance even before referral to the SST.

During this month the first Home-School Partnership Workshop was held in English and Spanish with the topic of "Getting the Most From Your Parent/Teacher Conference."

The book the writer chose was MOLLY'S PILGRIM by Barbara Cohen as the first integrated language arts unit. The story was adapted as needed while building upon the concept of the word, "pilgrim", for the Chapter 1 LEP third grade multicultural group placed with the writer in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program.

During week 2 of the first month, the introduction and administration of the PIAT pre-test of the at-risk students, and Portfolios were introduced as one means of assessment with a Whole Language thematic unit being the source of instruction. Integrating the curriculum through literature/

language arts, social studies and science, along with Whole Language strategies were the two preferences used in helping students with their "Emergent Literacy."

A slide presentation lesson was given by the writer in the Chapter 1 and ESL primary classrooms with the help of a shy, quiet fourth grade special education resource student. This student agreed to wear a pilgrim costume and carry huge story posters that each class could see close-up. The theme of the presentation was the "Thanksgiving Story" to increase student vocabulary and knowledge of literature stories read by their teachers during this season. The writer used special lesson techniques called Comprehensible Input and Sheltered English which helps not only the NEP/LEP children, but also the others at-risk. The follow-up was more teacher directed instruction in the writer's Extended Day Early Intervention Program group.

That same group of students began writing and drawing their own stories about the Indians who already lived on the land, and the Pilgrims who made their voyage to build their new way of life on the land of the Indians. These stories were placed in the student portfolios.

During weeks 3 and 4 of the first month, the writer used a thematic unit that continued the study of Native Americans. This occurred while introducing new vocabulary which included more study of Pilgrims, people moving and settling, travel by sea, food shortages, hardships, harvests (e.g., pumpkins, apples and other fruit). Other stories were

read about moving-settling in other parts of the new country of these English settlers, while later emphasizing American characters such as Johnny Appleseed and his adventures.

During the second month, weeks 5-6-7, the Home-School Parent Partnership monthly workshop continued to be the first Thursday. The theme was "Reading to Your Child" with a Pinata provided for the children who accompanied their parents that enclosed little books and treats for the children.

The Extended Day Early Intervention Program theme with the writer's third grade group was "Winter Holidays." The "guest speaker" planned for was none other than "that right Jolly ole Elf" with the pupils learning the famous NIGHT BEFORE CHRISTMAS poem. These three weeks were an integrated language arts unit of holiday celebrations around the world. It also included the thematic unit around the many versions of THE GINGERBREAD MAN. In addition, the writer envisioned and carried out "gingerbread and other cookies" as a theme. Therefore, the opportunity to read IF YOU GIVE A MOUSE A COOKIE by Laura Joffe Numeroff was not missed.

During the same month week 8, was planned around the thematic unit of "weather." Parents were informed what students in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program were learning. Parents had an opportunity to bring their primary child to the Home-School Partnership Workshop. The topic this month was "Remember: You Are Your Child's First and Foremost Teacher."

Planning for this week included a review of the theme for the month previously and of the other holidays in the winter season. The story, A CAMEL IN THE TENT, by Katherine Evans was a piece of literature that pupils could be taken "into, through and beyond." The weather was clearly a focus in this story opposite from the time of year it was then, which was winter. Another contrast of the weather was introduced in a funny story entitled, CLOUDY WITH A CHANCE OF MEATBALLS by Judi Barrett.

During month three, weeks 9-10-11, The Home-School Partnership Workshop had the topic of "The Importance of Self-Esteem." This month the language arts lessons were begun with the story of a young boy who grew up to become a great leader. His name was Martin Luther King, Jr. To carry on with the thematic unit of "weather", the story of THE SNOWY DAY by Ezra Jack Keats was an additional focus on winter. "Bears hibernate in the winter" was the theme for the kindergarten and 1st grade students that were read to by the Extended Day Early Intervention Program third grade students choral reading. The two stories selected were BROWN BEAR, BROWN BEAR, WHAT DO YOU SEE? by Bill Martin, Jr. To go into, through and beyond the literature, the integrated unit on "bears/winter" included ASK MR.BEAR by Marjorie Flack. The multi-graded/multi-age group did all benefit from these selected pieces of literature.

During month four, week 12, the theme of "sleeping" was carried over and rediscussed from the new word, hibernate.

The books chosen for this theme were IRA SLEEPS OVER by Bernard Waber and THERE'S A NIGHTMARE IN MY CLOSET by Mercer Mayer for grades K-3.

The Home-School Partnership Workshop was once again scheduled the first Thursday of this month. The writer and bilingual assistant carefully continued to plan for child care for the parents providing movies and popcorn for the "kids."

During month four, week 13, was centered on a theme of "Love." This month more holidays were discussed with books to emphasize the holidays to remember that included Abraham Lincoln and George Washington. Weeks 14-15 included the thematic units both of "Farm Life" and two famous farmers who had birthdays this month. ABRAHAM LINCOLN AS A BOY and GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BREAKFAST by Jean Fritz were stories about life on farms, poor and rich, and to carry out the "George Washington/cherry tree" theme, the book, CHERRIES AND CHERRY PITS by Vera B. Williams, was another story read about cherries. Cherries treats were eaten by the children.

Month five included weeks 16-17-18-19-20 which began with the theme of "Folk Tales and Fairy Tales." The Home-School Partnership Workshop topic was: "Read To Your Child And Your Child Will Read To You." The first story was RUMPELSTILTSKIN that was taken "into, through and beyond" the literature. The next story was again about little men, SNOW WHITE AND THE SEVEN DWARFS leading into the ST. PATRICK'S DAY theme and more folk tales about Leprechauns.

HANSEL AND GRETEL, CINDERELLA, and BEAUTY AND THE BEAST, THE BREMEN-TOWN MUSICIANS (a Grimm Folktale), THE THREE BILLY GOATS GRUFF, plus the many versions of GOLDILOCKS AND THE THREE BEARS (to reinforce that previous bear theme). The last story lead into the book, THE BEARS ON HEMLOCK MOUNTAIN by Alice Dalgliesh, followed by another story about mountains entitled, WHEN I WAS YOUNG IN THE MOUNTAINS by Cynthia Rylant. Other books about real people and situations everyone can relate to are the following: HENRY HUGGINS by Beverly Cleary, RAMONA THE PEST, also by Bevery Cleary, and ALEXANDER AND THE TERRIBLE, HORRIBLE, NO GOOD, VERY BAD DAY (which has versions in English and Spanish) by Judith Viorst. The writer concluded with WHERE THE WILD THINGS ARE by Maurice Sendak.

Month six included weeks 21-22-23 which carried over to an "Animal-Insect" theme beginning with the silly story, THE WHINGDINGDILLY by Bill Peet. At the Home-School Partnership Workshop the writer and bilingual assistant showed the parents: "How To Help Your Child With Homework."

The kindergarten tale which was read to that group by the writer's third grade students in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program was entitled, MAKE WAY FOR DUCKLINGS by Robert McCloskey. Another "into, through and beyond the literature" for first graders was THE VERY BUSY SPIDER by Eric Carle. Another kindergarten tale was THE VERY HUNGRY CATERPILLAR by Eric Carle, with three choices for the older students--POURQUOI TALES: THE CAT'S PURR and WHY FROG AND

SNAKE NEVER PLAY TOGETHER by Ashley Bryan, plus THE FIRE BRINGER retold by Margaret Hodges. There were also THE TALES OF OLGA DA POLGA by Michael Bond for level 3 pupils. Other stories at level 3 were with a "frog" them and these are: WHARTON AND THE KING OF THE SKIES by Russell E. Erickson, MORE STORIES JULIAN TELLS by Ann Cameron and at level 2 FROG AND TOAD TOGETHER by Arnold Lobel. Also, at level 2 is AN ANT-EATER NAMED ARTHUR by Bernard Waber. Many of these choices were followed with THE VELVETEEN RABBIT by Margery Williams for any primary age and/or the kindergarten story, LITTLE RABBIT'S LOOSE TOOTH by Lucy Bate.

The next month's theme was the spring holiday season and the final story was about a little girl all dressed up in fancy clothes is PHOEBE'S REVOLT by Natalie Babbit.

Month seven included weeks 24-25-26-27-28 which began with a story about a little boy and his close friend, the oak tree. The writer developed a unit for first grade students in an ESL/Bilingual classroom where both Spanish and English are spoken. The writer had the children in the third grade group who could speak Spanish learn the story with the Bilingual aide. It was shared with a kindergarten-first ESL group in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program. The name of this book is PEDRO Y SU ROBLE by Claude Levert-Carme Sole Vendrell. This story reinforced weather again, but in the fall, which was contrasted to the new season of spring. Again, the writer also took the opportunity to discuss weather for additional comparison, using the book about a

little girl who lives in a light house - KEEP THE LIGHTS BURNING, ABBIE by Peter and Connie Roop. This theme and books were used with the writer's third grade Extended Day Early Intervention Program.

These were followed by ONE FINE DAY by Nonny Hogrogian which is a level 2 book like the one preceding. This last story lead in to the "grocery store" theme with the pupils bringing a variety of empty boxes and containers for students to read labels to pretend purchase at the dramatic play center with this theme.

A follow-up meeting was held with the "Extended Day Team" to discuss the possiblility of extending this Early Intervention Program into the summer with parents' involvement with small groups of students at-risk.

At the beginning of this last month was the final workshop of the Home-School Partnership. The workshop topic was "How Will Your Parent Conference Be This Time? What questions Will You Ask The Teacher?" Parents also were surveyed about their interest in a summer Early Intervention Program. Another concept explored was a multi-age/multi-grade K-3 at-risk summer program. Those workshop parents who had a child or children in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program, were queried about improvement observed in listening, speaking, reading or writing regarding their child. Parents were also invited to the last day of the Extended Day Early Intervention Program to provide input about their impression of the program. This was pursued in English and Spanish with

the help of the bilingual aides that had assisted the "Extended Day Team."

During month eight - weeks 29-30-31-32 began with the two classes of Chapter 1/ESL Summer School students kindergarten through third grade and the Special Day class of learning disabled and other developmentally handicapped students. Parents were invited daily to participate which began each day with a Parent Continental Breakfast. There was an opportunity to communicate with the writer about any concerns they might have regarding the education of their child or children.

A "transportation" theme including all modes of transportation (bus, car, plane, train, subway, boat, air balloon and whatever else) the pupils could "brainstorm." This lead into the theme of ocean, beach, lake--salt and fresh water.

The American Independence Day celebration was emphasized with foods enjoyed by Americans during this celebration and summer picnics in general. Lastly, was the theme of nutrition--fruits and vegetables, how things grow, etc. Parents helped students plant seeds to eventually take home to grow.

The final task was to reassess this last month of implementation of the practicum, to complete the Portfolios began during the year for some students which extended into the summer, plus student/parent and teacher survey questionnaire that weren't completed before the close of the regular school year.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results

The at-risk student problem in the writer's school has been described as multifaceted, but this Practicum II has been concerned with the early prevention of school failure in the primary grades. Through an Extended Day Early Intervention Program for the Chapter 1 youngsters, improvement was observed in their listening, speaking, writing and reading skills, but still not significantly. Chapter 1-NEP/LEP students' parents became more considerably involved in the Home-School Partnership concept than any other group. By increasing even more success experiences for those students and others, failure can be minimized or eliminated for most all students in the kindergarten through grade three. By a better understanding of the research, and with prevention of those many at-risk problems causing failure, more children will be saved from the at-risk status every year.

Solution Strategies

In the 1992-93 school year, the Extended Day Early Intervention Program service began after-school in early

November until mid June. There were only six teachers including the writer instead of ten, who participated as the "Extended Day Team." The number of students in Chapter 1, Chapter 1-LEP, Chapter 1-LEP-Special Education Programs including those retained students in kindergarten through grade three, began with 45 and reduced to 32 by year's end. As the year continued with students moving, and with some parents taking them out of the program for various reasons, it was a difficult decision not to add more students. Each teacher averaged between 5 to 7 students initially for the 45 minute sessions twice weekly.

The Language Arts curriculum guide used was the EISS Handbook developed by the writer with the materials from the EISS training and High/Scope. The "Extended Day Team" explored a Whole Language and Literature-Based reading emphasis with using the Language Experience Approach as one of the ways to get all students writing, but especially the LEP youngsters. The stages of writing were observed from samples in the handbook by all of the "Extended Day Team" teachers. One teacher who was very familiar with the use of Portfolios, even at the kindergarten level, used this method of authentic assessment.

The writer was the teacher who used the EISS Continuum for the third grade group even though the continuum was designed for kindergarten through grade two levels of expectancy. From the writer's third grade group, two of the LEP students were reading and writing at early second grade

level. Two of the other LEP students were functionally non-literate, while one other who had been retained in second grade, was reading in grade three at mid-second grade. A look at the themes and books used for this group is described in Chapter IV.

The parent involvement goal was met through the Home-School Partnership Workshops which were successful throughout the eight months of implementation, November to July. The workshops were monthly with topics specifically determined by the "Extended Day Team," but all teachers were asked for input and participation. Since the workshops were given in English and Spanish by the writer and bilingual instructional assistant trained with the writer during the summer of 1992, the mode of presentation was successful. The training provided the Home-School Partnership Team with many overheads in English and Spanish. The writer would initially present in English no more than a short paragraph or to make special points, and then the information was given in Spanish. This mode of back and forth presentation in both languages worked well with the dominant Spanish speaking group of 10 to 20 parents per month. Child care and refreshments were provided. A variety of themes associated with holidays and cultural events of the community were tried throughout implementation with the following:

NOVEMBER: Giving Thanks and Sharing Potluck
DECEMBER: Celebrating Holidays Around the World
JANUARY: Celebrating a NEW YEAR for Parent Involvement
FEBRUARY: Sharing Sweets and Treats With Friends
MARCH: "Wearin' of the Green" Shamrock Fundraiser
APRIL: School Open House & Library Book Fair

Meet & Prepare for Cinco de Mayo Celebration
MAY: School & Community Cinco de Mayo Festivities
Getting the Most From Your Parent-Teacher Conferences
JUNE: Luau Potluck
JULY: Celebrating the 4th of July Barbecue Luncheon

Through the parental involvement program which extended into the summer, the writer found the students' greatest opportunity for success. The Home-School Partnership Workshop concept was found to be most successful with the Hispanic families. These families turned out monthly throughout the school year, and into summer school daily parent participation for the two weeks' duration. The Home-School Lending Library concept was planned throughout the summer session. Students borrowed books to be read at home with worksheets in English and Spanish for parental involvement.

Outcome Analysis

By the end of the implementation period, when queried about the six parent involvement/education issues identified earlier, the 10 primary teachers and resource specialist teacher will indicate that all six issues will have been effectively addressed (see Appendix A & F).

This outcome was achieved. The six parent involvement/education issues teachers wanted addressed were:

1) Involve parents in working with child--(i.e., assist these parents)
2) Homework - the place and the amount of time
3) Building Self-Esteem
4) Discipline
5) Encouraging responsible behavior (e.g., giving children chores - making sure they do their jobs)
6) How to communicate with teachers/school

The Extended Day Team of 6 teachers including the resource specialist, not 10 primary teachers as originally expected, did respond positively to all six of the above parent issues these teachers wanted addressed.

By the end of the implementation period when queried about the six literacy issues identified earlier, the 10 primary teachers and resource specialist teacher will indicate that at least four of these have been effectively addressed (see Appendix A & F).

This outcome was achieved. The question was: "Do you see ways literacy issues can be addressed?" These were the teachers' responses:

1) Sit with children and read
2) Family literacy (e.g., how to read to a child)
3) English Immersion (e.g., with a focus on oral language)
4) Have LEP "moms" with their children sometime
5) Also have Child Care when parents are in workshops
6) Have all correspondence from school to home translated accurately

Four of the literacy issues were addressed effectively according to responses of the Extended Day Team of six teachers. They were the following:

1) Sitting with their children and reading was stressed in the Principal's Newsletter as well as at two of the Home-School Partnership workshops that stressed the importance of reading to children.

2) Family literacy was emphasized with parents by explaining books made perfect gifts for children for holidays and birthdays. Parents were reminded that most teachers

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ordered low cost books for students monthly. Also, the Book Fair was another opportunity twice a year to buy books and help with the Teacher-Parent Fund Raiser. If parents could not read English, buying books in Spanish, the dominant first language of many of the parents, was quite possible. Also, to have older family members model reading and for these other members in the family to read to the youngsters. Then as their children learn to read, they can read to the others in the family as homework, but also for the pleasure of the whole family. During the summer the parents were also introduced to the public library through a field trip for parents and their children. Additionally, the children were able to borrow books in English or Spanish to take home to read to or with their parents, along with guide sheets for parents and children to discuss. The parents were surveyed informally if they liked the School Lending Library opportunity to continue during the next school year. They responded positively.

3) Child Care was provided for parents while attending the Home-School Partnership Workshops. The children were kept involved for the hour and one half with books to read, art materials, Disney videos and snacks.

4) All correspondence from school to home was translated from English into Spanish, the other language of over 40% of the parents. However, because of the literacy levels of many families in the community, there were still parents who would check with the office or staff members for better

understanding of some written communication.

By the end of the implementation period, developmentally appropriate Language Arts curriculum will be established by the writer, district curriculum director and early intervention team for at-risk kindergarten through grade 3 students as measured by the completed Early Intervention Curriculum Handbook.

This outcome was achieved. The Early Intervention Language Arts Curriculum Handbook developed with the EISS and High-Scope materials was completed by the writer before implementation, but was considered to be an on-going project throughout implementation as materials were tried and tested as to their effectiveness in working with the at-risk students.

By the end of the implementation period, the Extended Day Team and Extended Day bilingual aides will be trained in the use of the Early Intervention Curriculum Handbook and Early Intervention for School Success (EISS) Continuum diagnostic assessment tool as measured by the inservice record of attendance.

This outcome was not achieved. Only the Extended Day Team teachers were trained by the principal/director of curriculum and writer in the use of the Early Intervention Curriculum Handbook and Early Intervention for School Success (EISS) Continuum. The aides were hired later and there was no opportunity for further training. However, the

aides followed the teachers' directives and did not make observations of the children to complete the EISS Continuum. It was unfortunate that more Extended Day Team teachers did not use the EISS Continuum as a diagnostic tool for their Language Arts curriculum planning. During the eight months of implementation of early intervention with five teachers, the writer was at a disadvantage to direct what was expected and agreed to by the principal/director of curriculum. He wanted the Extended Day Team to use the continuum for evaluation purposes, but this was not enforced by administration. The writer believes it was just assumed the continuums were being used by the Extended Day Team.

By the end of the implementation period, identified at-risk students participating in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program, will show improvement from the pre-EISS Continuum diagnostic assessment tool (see Appendix E) to the post-EISS Continuum of at least one developmental level in each of the areas of listening, speaking, writing and reading or through diagnostic authentic assessment (i.e., Portfolios, tape recordings and anecdotal records).

This outcome was not achieved for all at-risk students. It has already been discussed that only the writer did use the EISS Continuum from the beginning of the program service in early November to mid June. Of the seven total Chapter 1 students in the writer's third grade group, one left the district midway through the program. Five were classified Chapter 1-LEP, although one child's classification of LEP

was questionable. Two of the LEP students were also in Special Education. Two students started after the others as SST referrals for early intervention strategies. The one FEP male student who was a Chapter 1 SST referral entered two months into the program. He exhibited all the characteristics of an Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disordered child. His primary problem was attention span limitations and following directions. This overly active child was a more successful reader in that he was reading at second grade level, but his story writing was almost unintelligible although he could "read" what he wrote generally if he was able to attend to the task. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised pretest showed an age equivalent of 8 years 1 month while the posttest age equivalent was 8 years 7 months which partly could be attributed to the pupil's attention problems. On the EISS there was an increase by one level in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, but he was not consistent in his performance.

Two of the LEP students read at the same second grade level as the boy just described. They could write legibly combining at least three to five sentences or more to create a paragraph using invented spelling, with occasional periods and capitalization. These three students then increased on the EISS Continuum in their oral language of listening and speaking by at least one or more levels, with three improving more in emergent literacy in reading and the two LEP students increasing significantly in writing as well, even

though the one LEP boy moved mid-year.

One of the above male students who was considered LEP was learning English over again because he had been living and was schooled in Mexico the past year or more. As a third grader, his English language skills tested on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test were age equivalent 5 to 6 years old. He had learned Spanish because Spanish was primarily spoken in the home in Mexico. English was the dominant language at home when living in the U.S. as his mother is an American. However, Spanish was spoken also as his father is a Mexican National.

On the Language Assessment Scales LAS English Level 1 Form A, Grades K-5, he was at Level 3 at the beginning of the school year compared to Level 5 at the end of the year. His LAS Spanish was the same score as in English at the pretest-(Level 3) as the posttest-(Level 5). The writer considers this growth significant as well as the gain of 9 months on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised which showed 5 years 7 months pretest and 6 years 4 months posttest. Both of these tests measure oral language development. Additionally, from the EISS Continuum it was observed that this student improved by one level or more in listening and speaking, but also two-three levels in reading and writing.

The above boy's mother was actively involved with all of her children's learning, but it was not the more typical parental involvement in the school setting. While waiting the one hour for this child when he was in the Extended Day

Early Intervention Program, she worked with her other younger children doing homework, reading to them, etc. She was willing to try out various activites with her children at home that the writer had asked her for feedback. Yet she did not attend the Home-School Partnership Workshops.

From four of the six students the writer worked with who were LEP and one who only spoke English, but Spanish was his first language, two began with minimal sight words and little written expressive language skills other than copying. The use of Language Experience dictation did work well with these students, but these two could not produce a complete sentence on their own. Even sentence starters were not possible for these two pupil's because of lacking in word recognition and knowing little sound/symbol relationships.

One of these two youngsters, a female LEP student who attended regularly, found a great deal of pride in learning to recognize between 15 and 20 words from her personal key words on cards from which she did find success. She was new into Special Education at the beginning of the school year for 25% of the day. She was also receiving ESL assistance although she did not like to be taught or spoken to in Spanish even though this was her first language. Her Language Assessment Scales in Spanish Level 1 Form A (Grades K-5) in May, 1992, were Level 3. In 1993 they were the same. However, the LAS English Level 1 Form B (Grades K-5) was Level 5 in May, 1993. Yet her CTBS scores in English reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, language mechanics and

language expression she was at 1 percentile in May, 1992. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised showed an age equivalent span of 5 years 0 months to 5 years 5 months. The EISS Continuum showed growth in Oral Language/Listening and Speaking and Emergent Literacy/Writing and Reading by one level or more in each of these areas because her Emergent Literacy started at such a beginning level she found success.

Only the most severe at-risk non-reader, the male student, who began late and did not attend the program regularly, improved little in reading and writing. This boy made very few gains other than to copy his stories he dictated and to learn how to pair read with one partner, the oldest, but smallest student in size in the group, the other retainee. This non-reader who was the most at-risk, was also the largest and was retained, but not threatened by his partner. He was very unmotivated presumably because of lack of success. Even art exploration activities for his stories was not something in which he seemed to enjoy. Both the girl and the boy described above, who were limited readers had low level oral language development as well as emergent literacy struggles. However, there was a gain by one level in each area on the EISS Continuum for this boy because of his young beginning levels. This boy was referred by his teacher to the SST within a month after enrollment for his low level language arts skills. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised showed an age equivalent span from 7 years 0 months

to 7 years 6 months. This growth was the most significant in his receptive language development.

The male child whose first language as a toddler/pre-schooler was Spanish, but now could only understand some Spanish and spoke English, was retained in second grade. He was very small in statue as described above which worked in his favor under these circumstances. The writer was very familiar with this child because he had been hospitalized and ill for most of his first time in second grade. He was home taught the remainder of the year by the writer.

One on one he was reading at the end of first grade level at the close of that school year. His oral language skills were at middle second grade while the expressive written language was at mid-first. He benefited from the story writing by dictating, copying and then reading his story, but discussed he did not like to write his own stories. What was the most noticeable about this child was the fact that he fatigued easily; and his long term memory for information stored could not be retrieved easily without many clues. He was able to learn basic sight words from flash cards which was helped by his own visual clues drawn on the cards. Words in context that he could "sound-out" became another way for this youngster to read. Then he began to use models in reading to write, which was quite an accomplishment for him. If asked, he would say, "I don't like to write." Yet there was progress; he is now composing.

On the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised his age

equivalent was at age 7 years 4 months in the beginning of the Extended Day program while at 8 years 3 months at the end. He showed growth on the EISS Continuum by one level or more in each of the areas of listening, speaking, reading and writing. The CTBS test given at the end of his second year in second grade highest scores were in Language Mechanics at the 37th percentile and Math Computation-49th percentile, Math Concepts-52nd percentile, and Total Mathematics at the 52nd percentile. As a third grader these CTBS scores were very depressed as his highest Math Computation was the 13th percentile and Reading Vocabulary was the 6th percentile while all others were at the 1st and 2nd percentile with Total Mathematics at the 3rd percentile. This is the writer's other Special Education student for 30% of the school day, but not for math. He was also with a Chapter 1 Aide for small group instruction a limited portion of the day for reading-language arts.

By June 30, 1993, the writer's district specialist will post-test at the school year end the at-risk population pretested as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test with 75% of this population showing 8 months growth.

This outcome was not achieved. The writer expected that before June 30, 1993, the district specialist would have pretested, using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT), the at-risk students referred to the Student Study Team. All students were not tested. Five of the writer's

third grade group were each pre and post tested on the PPVT-Forms L and M by the writer during the after school program (see Table 1).

There were two students who were pretested later than the other three because they began later, and the one boy most at-risk moved in May. There was not a 75% growth with these five students, but a 40% growth of 8 months or more with an 80% growth of 6 months on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised, a receptive, not expressive language test.

With the help of the bilingual aide to read to the whole group, the writer was able to work with one child at a time to complete surveys, observe and test as necessary during implementation.

By June 30, 1993, 10 primary teachers involved in this practicum will demonstrate 20% more positive responses in a post survey (see Appendix F) asking their perceptions of early intervention services to what was being provided from a similar survey done in October of 1992.

This outcome was achieved with those teachers in the Exteneded Day Early Intervention Program. There were 5 primary teachers involved in this practicum plus the resource specialist teacher instead of 10 teachers. The 6 teachers did respond with 25% more positive responses to the principal's survey asking their perception of the present early intervention services since the implementation of the

Table 1

Results of Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised

Form L (11-92) Age Equivalent	Date of Birth	Form M (6-93) Age Equivalent
7-4	2-13-83	8-3
(12-92)7-0	5-27-83	7-6(5-93)
5-7	9-01-83	6-4
(01-93)8-1	10-13-83	8-7
5-0	12-01-83	5-5

Extended Day Early Intervention Program beginning in November 1992 to year-end 1993. The plan for Early Intervention with parents and children for the summer session was also included with the survey for perusal.

By June 30, 1993, the writer will pre and post survey (see Appendix C & D) the parents/primary students involved in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program, twice weekly for 45 minute periods, if since implementation of this program are observed any positive changes in their child's oral language and emergent literacy, (i.e., listening, speaking, writing and reading) as measured by a 20% or more increase in positive responses.

This outcome was not achieved. Unfortunately, the writer was not successful in getting the other primary teachers involved as the Extended Day Team to get these all completed because of time constraints and children moving out while others were redistributed. The writer tried to get them completed by parents through the Home-School Partnership monthly times together. Since there were so many non or limited English speaking parents present each time, it was almost impossible to have the opportunity to verbally translate and talk to the parents individually. However, from what was collected there was a 20% more positive response return to the parent/child survey.

By June 30, 1993, the 10 primary teachers involved in the practicum will be able to identify and tell about at

least one article in the literature provided in the handbook that they found to be particularly meaningful in bringing about changes in instructional practices or their perceptions of at-risk young children.

This outcome was not achieved with those teachers in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program. The 5 primary teachers instead of 10 did identify and tell about one article or idea included in the Handbook. The writer learned through an informal survey with the teachers what they found to be particularly meaningful in bringing about changes in instructional practices or their perceptions of "at-risk" young children. The writer has tried to include in this report what was suggested and previously missing from the literature review.

Discussion

Unexpected Implementation Outcomes

The boy in the writer's group described with what did appear to be Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), was referred to the Student Study Team by his teacher. He was placed in the Extended Day Early Intervention Program because of his many problems in the regular classroom. This service from the Chapter 1 program was considered to be the intervention attempted or the prereferral before Special Education testing would be considered. However, most likely he would not qualify because he was a bright boy with excellent oral language and good reading

skills. If he did qualify, it would probably be for written language expression because he was very poor in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar and composition. He moved the last week of school. There is no way to learn what happened to him except that he would meet failure positively in fourth grade without support. His mother was a single parent with this one child. She was struggling with his behavior problems because too much of the time he was out of control in and out of the classroom, which did effect other students' learning as well as his own.

The difference between the two non-reading students in the writer's group was that the girl could feel pride with a success a day she would find in the language rich environment the writer, ESL teacher and aide tried to provide. The other advantage she had was that she was in Special Education in the resource program with the writer. Her successes were building one on top of the other with the additional opportunities of small group and individual instruction. Her language development skills were increasing as her self-esteem was becoming positive. Was she really learning disabled? What was the effect of her language minority status? What is known is her language deficits caused oral and written language skill problems for her in the regular classroom during the past three years in school. This did put her at-risk for failure. Now she was succeeding some.

The boy who was a non-reader had been a referral to the Student Study Team, but even with this after school

intervention, he found little success. Part of his feelings of failure were attributed to the many schools he had attended, plus mother's incarceration and his lack of general care. His self-esteem was very low and the affective filter seemed to interfere too often to allow him success. He did work for treats, but the writer learned he was one of the two students in this group that had such little self-control that they each helped themselves to what was not theirs. The other was the extremely active one. This non-reading boy did qualify and was placed in Special Education just before the end of the school year, but he moved three weeks before the close of the school year. Will his records will be sent for eventually? Presently, there has been no request. This means if he has started to school anywhere, he is meeting more failure without a support system working on his behalf. The writer asks, "Did we help this child at-risk who was "drowning academically?" The answer is not known, but hopefully someone recognizes this boy is "crying out for help." His chances are slim of getting the help he needs; without his records, no one will know he was placed in Special Education with what looks like a more severe learning disability to need 51% or more of the day in a special day class. He needed the help when he was in first grade and referred by his teacher then, but he moved and was somewhere else in second grade coming back in third grade right before the winter break.

The question could be asked, "Why wasn't he given the

help he needed before third grade?" It was learned from his records that he was retained in first grade with someone thinking that would be the way to help him. He continued to meet failure head-on both in school and apparently at home and in the community as well. How can a child like this be saved from so much failure? How can we provide enough successes to overcome the failure? These are extremely difficult questions to answer.

Discussion

Strategies Prior to Implementation

The first activity even before the implementation of the practicum began with helping the Hispanic community with a Mexican-Independence Day celebration. This included the students participating with cultural dances they had learned with the help of a parent volunteer during the previous summer arranged by the writer. During the school day two Hispanic parents and the bilingual assistant community liaison helped the writer with a Multicultural Assembly for the whole school. Students learned why Mexican families celebrate this day of September 16 just as American families celebrate the 4th of July. This was followed in the evening with entertainment for the community with a Mariachi band, students dancing and with parents selling food in the park next to the school. After paying for the Mariachi, the parents donated the remaining proceeds to help children in the school setting who are at-risk for failure.

At the beginning of October during "Back to School Night", the writer and bilingual assistant gave the first Home-School Partnership Workshop to try the skills learned in the previous summer through the state department training. Parent conferences were scheduled that month which was earlier than usual, and the principal had asked for a practice session of what was proposed by the writer as early intervention through parent involvement.

During the first few weeks of school the writer put together the EISS Language Arts Curriculum Handbook together with the approval of the Principal/Director of Curriculum. This included the EISS Continuum. The Extended Day Team was inserviced by the above in the use of the Handbook for the Language Arts curriculum design.

Further Discussion

The writer has found the early intervention is the only answer to prevent children from failure--the earlier the better. If children are passed on without the necessary assistance for successes they need to feel adequate, it is possibly as damaging as retention might be. Although retention is generally not the answer in helping the child who is failing, if the child is given a special program or some definite help to provide immediate successes, with great care and consideration, the case could be studied carefully in certain circumstances. The example the writer has in mind is the boy in the writer's program who is very small and

young in his behavior, and with lots of help for him to succeed, he is definitely making progress.

From the writer's experience with her own son who was retained in first grade because of hyperactivity and non attending behaviors, later to be found learning disabled and was put in Special Education in third grade all through high school. However, he was also advanced from sixth grade to eight grade. This was done because socially and emotionally he was at his chronological age, but with the learning disability would probably never be at grade level academically. He did graduate from high school, went to trucking school and diesel mechanic training, entered the Army and was discharged honorably. He was in the active reserves and went on to Community College for a couple of years. He went through the College Learning Disabled Program and learned boat building. Presently, he is a long haul truck driver, but still has the Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and Learning Disability primarily in written language, reading comprehension, but also in mathematics. These conditions hamper his successes, but he has learned to compensate.

Now this year the writer has learned his son was retained in first grade because he didn't learn to read as his father. The school reports he has a learning disability and the child is getting some extra assistance. Already his self-esteem is affected. He will need many success experiences to overcome the problems. Whether he will be put ahead some time throughout his school career perhaps will make the

difference of whether he continues and graduates. Otherwise, he could become another statistic of a high school drop-out, who was once an at-risk child like his father, and all the others who become at-risk when school systems fail them.

A Further Look at Recent Literature

Cradler, McRobbie & Fish (1993) provide excerpts from a full report on Chapter 1 policy and some other information on the status of the Chapter 1 reauthorization. There are major changes in the Chapter 1 Compensatory Education and Chapter 2 block grant programs. The Clinton administration has proposed changes in the reauthorization of these programs that include linking Chapter 1 to national standards, and designing a funding formula to target more money to high poverty school. What looks promising is a support inclusion of LEP in Chapter 1, replace Chapter 2 block grants with a new professional development program, and support the application of technology within Chapter 1 programs.

The changes proposed for Chapter 1 are as radical as they are necessary and the report recommends the new Chapter 1 legislation incorporate the following interrelated elements as outlined by Cradler, et al. 1.) Concentration of funds on schools with the greatest numbers of poor children. 2.) Eligibility based on the schoolwide level of poverty, not student achievement. 3.) Emphasize prevention, not catching up. 4.) Flexibility in local use of Chapter 1

funds. 5.) Assessment that is performance-based. 6.) Accountability based on standards. 7.) Professional development for all school staff.

A recent report on parent involvement from National PTA (1993) survey found that parents do understand that children are far more likely to do well in school if their parents are actively engaged in the children's education. Teachers could point that out only too quickly, but now the PTA survey found that 95% of parents said they favor written plans for parent involvement. These parents believe their involvement is crucial to school success and now they want the guidance of how to help.

At an elementary school in Colorado, parent observations have become an important part of an overall plan for school improvement. A negative experience prompted the principal to consider positive ways to use parent observers. The faculty and principal studied ways that parent participation could benefit both parents and the school. They agreed on two priorities for their school says Meadows (1993). These were: 1. to increase the quality of parent-school partnerships, and 2. to model and build students' self-esteem. The two goals let to the development of what they called the "parent observation process" and they worked on improving students' self-esteem and creating a School-Home Partnership through these observations. Principal Meadows says "The parent observations are giving us a clearer picture of what we need to continue doing well and what we need to improve."

Some new information regarding assessment is that "All children--disabled and non-disabled--should be able by age 3 to participate in group activities and follow directions, and by age 6 to demonstrate some basic mathematical concepts and listening skills, a federally funded research center has recommended" (Viadero, 1993, p. 4).

There is a new focus on early years according to Viadero with two new reports released last month aimed at the early-childhood years. "The first sets down 21 educational outcomes for children at age 3; the second outlines 25 goals for 6 year-olds" (p. 4).

Chasnoff (1993) discusses one of the most frequently asked question from educators: "What can you tell us about working with drug-exposed children in our classrooms?" He says that drug-exposed children are more similar to other children than they are different and cautions against labeling them. Those special techniques used for helping the ADD or hyperactive child in the classroom work just as well when the child just happens to be prenatally drug-exposed.

If a child such as just described may need physical, speech or occupational therapy they can be referred. Such programs as Head Start provide the early intervention with parents involved, so the parents and children will make a great difference in the outcome.

Substance abuse can touch everyone's lives in America today whether rich or poor, rural or urban. Drug related incidents even in elementary school are signs that tell us

prevention or intervention must begin at a very young age, but just how young? Is starting in early childhood programs too early? Shouse (1993) looks at social competence, problem solving skills, autonomy, and a sense of purpose and future are important traits found in what he has found that Benard calls resiliency theory. The '"the resilient child" is the child who "works well, plays well, loves well, and expects well"' according to Benard's paper (1991, pp.3-6). There is High/Scope Curriculum related to resiliency and research outcomes that develop personality traits necessary for prevention, but intervention is another problem that must be dealt with because there are no long range studies as yet.

Providing cultural sensitivity in the young child's learning environment is told by Jordan, Peel, and Peel (1993) through a narration of what happens in one such class. These authors believe that "issues of multicultural diversity influence educational planning and programing for students of all ages. Students take pride in their own cultures, while respecting the cultures of others when they have been taught sensitivity thoughtfully and effectively. Preschool and early childhood classrooms are excellent environments in which to foster an appreciation for multicultural differences" (Jordan, et al., 1993, p. 21). The writer holds the same beliefs and has practiced cultural sensitivity for the past twenty-five years teaching in the early and middle years educational settings.

It is the writer's contention as the author's, that in addition to differences in culture, differences in language pose unique problems. No one can deny that language minority students are a growing number represented in our young learners who may also become at-risk. The question remains of how best to help these children to not feel the brunt of being different, and is the challenge to all educators who work with these linguistic and cultural minority families.

Recommendations

1.) Follow the guidelines of early education professionals when setting up prekindergarten through third grade programs.

2.) Consider non-graded primary classes and even multi-age groups. Children develop at different rates and with varied strengths. They can help each other.

3.) Use Cooperative Learning, Peer and Cross-Age Tutording in all grades including the preschool.

4.) Provide early intervention for any child who is not feeling successful in any area of the curriculum.

5.) If a child needs Special Education, make sure that child is placed before fourth grade. Take care in labeling any child, especially the ones at-risk.

6.) If Chapter 1 is a possibility for a school with children who can qualify, make sure the program is not "watered down" where there is no difference in the help "at-risk" children are receiving.

7.) Find ways to build Home-School-Community Partnerships. Parents are the greatest asset to a school.

8.) Provide communication going home in the language of the home whenever possible. Make school an inviting place that welcomes everyone and is open to listen.

9.) Respect every child and the child's language spoken in the home. Respect the culture of the family. Inbite families to share their culture. Share with others, but especially children, what you learn.

10.)Be sincere and sensitive to the needs of the families in the community. Invite the community to be involved in helping students however possible.

11.)Every child should have the opportunity of being in the regular classroom with the general school population, but not necessarily for the whole day. If extra help is needed or there is a handicapping condition which would interfere with other's learning, consider each case separately.

12.)Provide instruction in the language of the child whenever possible with the goal of English ever present. They need the "bridge" to help them cross over to English. Take caution and let the child lead the way!

13.)If a retention appears to be what the child would benefit from because of immaturity or whatever other reason, take great care. The child may "feel" this decision's outcome far too long afterward.

Dissemination

This practicum will be disseminated to the Delta Kappa Gamma Society International Headquarters in Austin, Texas. The writer has received two scholarships from this profes-signal organization at the state and international levels.

The school district of the writer will also be receiving a copy for the teacher resource library. The writer has had the opportunity to have gleaned from this practicum what can be put into practice as one means of early intervention. Attempts to share with all the Head Start, kindergarten and primary teachers, the EISS and High-Scope materials will be pursued by the writer. Getting the Head Start parents involed with the Home-School-Community Partnership whole school concept of parental involvement, will be encouraged.

With the extensive accumulation of literature to help at-risk children, the writer will attempt writing an article for The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin and California Association of Resource Specialists (CARS). When there is a success in the publishing of an article submitted, more attempts will be made.

Teaching at the community college or university level is the goal of the writer when completing the doctorate. The literature research and classroom research will continue in the hopes and belief that someone else can benefit from what has been learned from living and working with at-risk children. Hopefully, no one in the future should be able to

graduate with a teaching credential without understanding the needs of the multilingual and multicultural, mildly, moderately or severely disabled, drug exposed and abused children in society today. In addition, the government at both the state and federal levels now recognize the importance of early intervention to help every child--rich or poor--non-handicapped or handicapped--bright or slow--any color or any race--speaking English or any other language--to succeed in school in order to succeed in society.

Practicum Implementation Follow-up

The at-risk intervention for kindergarten through grade three that has been implemented is the Extended Day Early Intervention Program after-school for two hours weekly. During the grade four Chapter 1 transition year, the district is considering hiring Chapter 1 instructional assistants for an hour per day to work with those students. These fourth grade classes are those with students who are still below the 35th percentile on the CTBS scores from last spring, May, 1993. This is to be in addition to the same Chapter 1 service that has been provided to the students before implementation in kindergarten through grade three. The parents have been surveyed during this first month of school year 1993-94 to determine which parents want the Chapter 1 services for their child or children.

The Extended Day Early Intervention Program has begun again this past October after-school for two hours weekly,

on Tuesday and Thursday. The writer is working with the teachers and administration to help tally those Chapter 1 students whose parents have agreed to the Chapter 1 services.

The first Chapter 1 Parent Meeting was scheduled for mid-October and the writer, as the new Parent Coordinator, has begun planning for the newly formed Home-School-Community Partnership Program. During the parent meeting, the group of eleven parents were surveyed whether they would like to have their child receive the after-school services of the Extended Day Early Intervention Program. Questions from the audience were encouraged to get parent input in the school's Chapter 1 Program. Parents were also surveyed regarding the day and time of the week best to meet. It was explained by the writer that the Home-School-Community Partnership Program was a Chapter 1 sponsored schoolwide program because all parents of NEP/LEP and Special Education would also be invited. Each of these programs required parental involvement in their child's learning needs, but parental involvement benefits all school children.

The parents were informed that the Parental Involvement requirement in these programs is part of the funding mandates. This involvement by parents of Chapter 1 means the following:

1.) School will have an annual meeting of parents of participating children as well as providing opportunities to have regular meetings.

2.) School will provide timely information about the Chapter 1 program to parents.

3.) School will make parents aware of the parental involvement requirements and other relevant provisions of the program.

4.) School will provide information, to the extent practicable, in a language and form that parents can understand.

Parental Involvement must include:

A. Training parents to work with their children in the home and to understand program requirements.

B. Training parents, teachers and principals to build partnerships between home and school.

C. Training teachers, principal and other staff members involved in the program to work effectively with the parents of participating children.

D. Assessing parent involvement effectiveness annually.

The Home-School-Community Partnership schoolwide intial meeting was scheduled for Friday, October 29, 1993 during Red Ribbon Week for prevention of drug, alcohol and tobacco addiction. A police officer was invited as the guest speaker to give a presentation to parents on this topic.

The December schoolwide meeting was focused as a followup to the student presentation on Prevention and

Intervention of Child Abuse. In November there was a four day training for a team from Chapter 1 schools to include a parent, teacher, instructional assistant and administrator. The goal of the last Home-School-Community Partnership meeting was to make parents aware of this training to elicit their participation.

Parents in the community are also now being given the opportunity for school participation and involvement through an English as a Second Language class for adults. This class is being provided through the Head Start Program. The whole school non-English speaking community is invited to attend.

References

Bete, C. L. Co., Inc. (1993). About alcohol, child abuse and child neglect. MA: South Deerfield, A scriptographic booklet.

Bishopp, T. (1987, March). An alternative learning experience for a special kind of student. NASSP Bulletin, pp. 116-118.

Bowman, B. T. (1991, December). Educating language minority children. Eric Digest ED 317 273.

Brandt, R. (1992). On building learning communites: A conversation with Hank Levin. Educational Leadership, 50(1), 19-23.

Brandt, R. S. (1986, November). On early education:A conversation with Barbara Day. Educational Leadership, 44, 28-69.

Brewer, J. A. (1987, January). Ready or not? Early Years, pp. 96-99.

Cavazos, L. F. (1989). Building bridges for at-risk children. Principal, 68(5), 6-10.

Chan, M. M. (1988, October). What we already know about teaching ESL writers. English Journal, pp. 84-85.

Chapter 1 Policy Manual. (1990). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education Compensatory Education Programs.

Chasnoff, I. J. (1993). Hope for drug-exposed children. The Challenge, pp. 1-3. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Clary, Jr., E. (1993). More Data on Retention. Phi Delta Kappan, 74(5), 424.

Conner, T. (1987). The quiet child: Student at risk. Academic Therapy, 22(5), 523-527.

Cradler, J. (1993). Looking Ahead. Thrust for Education Leadership, 23(2), 46.

Cummins, J. (1989). A theoretical framework for bilingual special education. Exceptional Children, 56(2), 111-119.

Curr, M. (1982, December). Held back in kindergarten. Early Years, pp. P3, P27.

Dart, B. (1992, September 16). Teachers find more ill students. The Press-Enterprise,, pp. A1, A10.

Day, B. & Anderson, J. (1992). Assessing the challenges ahead. The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 58(4), 5-10.

De La Luz Reyes, M. (1992). Challenging venerable assumptions: Literacy instruction for linguistically different students. Harvard Education Review, 62(4), 427-446.

Dixon, D. N. & Nessel, D. (1983). Language Experience Approach to Reading (and Writing), LEA for ESL. Hayward, CA: The Alemany Press.

Dutton, B. & Dyer, P. A. (1991). Story reading and telling: a way to increase positive attitudes and self-esteem in reading. The California Reader, 24(2), 14-17.

Elam, S. M., Lowell C. R. & Gallup, A. M. (1993). The 25th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools, Parent Involvement. Phi Delta Kappan, 75(2) 149.

Elementary Grades Task Force (1992). It's elementary! Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Evans, R. (1990). Making Mainstreaming Work Through Prereferral Consultation, Educational Leadership, 48(1) 73-77.

Family English Literacy Program (FELP), (1992). ESEA, Title VII, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, U.S. Department of Education.

Fetbrandt, S. (1992, August 23). Two more R's in school picture: readiness and retention. The Press Enterprise p. B3.

Friesen, D. (1984). Too much, too soon? Principal, 63(4), 14-18.

Frymier, J. (1992). Children who hurt, children who fail. Phi Delta Kappa, 74(3), 257-259.

Glogau, L. & Fessel, M. (1967). The nongraded primary school. New York: Parker.

Harry, B. (1992). Making sense of disability: Low-income, Puerto Rican parents' theories of the problem. Exceptional Children, 59(1), 27-40.

High/Scope Foundation (1990). Key experiences in language and literacy development. The High/Scope K-3 Curriculum p. 73-74.

Hill, D. (1991). Tasting failure: Thoughts of an at-risk learner. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(4), 308-310.

Hiser, D. C. & Benn, W. (1993). Early intervention for school success report to the legislature 1991-92. Orange County, CA: Orange County Department of Education.

Hiser, D. C., Benn, W. & Smith, J. (1992). Early intervention for school success report to the legislature 1990-91. Orange County, CA: Orange County Department of Education.

Hohmann, C. (1989, Spring/Summer). Update: High/Scope's K-3 curriculum. High/Scope ReSource, pp. 4-7.

Jennings, J. F. (1992). Lessons learned in Washington, D. C. Phi Delta Kappa, 74(4), 303-307.

Jordan, L.A., Peel, H. A. & Peel, B. B. (1993). Cultural sensitivity in the young child's learning environment. The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 60(1), 21-25.

Kagan, D. (1988). How do teachers define students at risk? The Clearing House, 61(7).

Kelly, P. R. (1990, March). Guiding young students' response to literature. The Reading Teacher, pp. 464-470.

Kuersten, J. (1987, November). Report cards and family stress. pta today, p.22.

Leinhardt, G. (1980). Transition rooms: Promoting maturation or reducing education? Journal of Education Psychology, 72, 55-61.

Maher, P. (1989). Child abuse: The undetected special need. British Journal of Special Education, 16(1), 11-13.

Martin, R. (1993, Sept/Oct). Federal Circuit Court rules on Inclusion. LDA/Newsbriefs, pp. 3, 14.

Meadows, B. J. (1993). Through the eyes of parents. Educational Leadership, 51(2), 31-34.

Mitchell, A. (1989). Old baggage, new visions: Shaping policy for early childhood programs. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(9) 664-672.

Natale, J. A. (1991, January). Promotion or retention? Ideas are changing--again. Executive Educator, pp. 15-18.

Parenting and Community Education Office (1992). California strategic plan for parental involvement in education. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Peck, P. (1988, November/December). The child at risk: The shadow on the classroom wall. Instructor, pp. 30-32.

Peck, P. (1989). The child at risk: In search of solutions. Instructor, 98(5), 28-30.

Peck, P. (1989). The child at risk: Closing in on success. Instructor, 98(6), 30-32.

Peterson, S. E., DeGracie, J. S., & Ayabe, C. R. (1987). A longitudinal study of the effects of retention/promotion on academic achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 24(1), 107-118.

Powell, D. R. (1991, December). Parent education and support programs. Eric Digest ED 320 661.

Rawson, H. E. & Rawson, J. E. (1993). Producing that winning feeling in children at-risk. The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 59(3) 26-32.

Ruhland, T. (1993). Fear not the quiet child. Educational Leadership, 50(5), 83.

School Readiness Task Force, (1988). Here they come: Ready or Not! Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Shepard, L. A. & Smith, M. L. (1986). Synethesis of research on school readiness and kindergarten retention. Educational Leadership, 44, 78-86.

Shouse, C. (1993, Spring). Early childhood education & substance abuse prevention. High/Scope ReSource, pp. 1,10.

Slavin, R. E. & Madden, N. A. (1989, February). What works for students at risk: A research synthesis, Educational Leadership, 46 4-13.

Slavin, R. F. & Yampolsky, R. (1991). Success for all: Effects on language minority students. (Report No. 14). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.ED 331 294)

Smith, L. L. (1970). Teaching in a nongraded school. New York: Parker.

Shepard, L. A. & Smith, M. L. (1986, November). Synthesis of research on school readiness and kindergarten retention. Educational Leadership, pp. 78-96.

Stevens, L. J. & Price, M. (1992). Meeting the challenge of educating children at risk. Phi Delta Kappa, 74(1), 18-23.

Strickland, D. S. (1990). Emergent literacy: How young children learn to read. Educational Leadership, 47(6), 18-23.

Sulzby, E. (1990). Emergent literacy: Kindergartners write and read. Bloomington, IN: Agency for Instructional Technology.

Topping, K. (1987). Paired reading: A powerful technique for parent use. The Reading Teacher, 40(7), 608-614.

Topping, K. (1989). Peer tutoring and paired reading: Combining two powerful techniques. The Reading Teacher, 42(7), 488-494.

Trelease, J. (1985). The read-aloud handbook. New York: Viding-Penguin.

Troppman, J. (1991, Apr./May). Who is really "at-risk"? Sacramento, CA: CARS Newsletter, 11(5), 10.

Trute, J. W. ((1991). Improving collaboration among primary teachers to facilitate mainstreaming of limited English proficient children (Doctoral practicum, Nova University, 1991). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 338 078)

Viadero, D. (1993, October 6). D'Nealian writing method helps students go from 'balls and sticks' to 'tummies and tails.' Education Week, p. 6.

Viadero, D. (1993, October 6). Disabled children included in reports on skills goals. Education Week, p. 4.

Weikart, D. P. (1989, Spring/Summer). Hard choices in early childhood care and education: A view to the future. High/Scope ReSource, pp. 1 & 12-21.

Werner, L. (1987). Early prevention of school failure: Implementing a developmental program. Peotone, Ill: Nationally Validated Project.

What Schools Can Do (1987). What Works: Schools That Work: Educating Disadvantaged Children. United States Department of Education. (1987, October) What Schools Can Do to Help Disadvantaged Children. Education Digest, pp. 14-18.

APPENDIX A

CHAPTER 1 PILOT EXTENDED DAY TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE #1

CHAPTER 1 PILOT EXTENDED DAY TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE #1

A Chapter 1 Extended Day after school program was piloted May, 1992 by four primary teachers. This program was four weeks in length and served "teacher chosen" Chapter 1 students. These questions are directed to the pilot teachers as a survey of the pilot program to determine meeting Chapter 1/LEP student needs:

1. What worked well?

2. What do we need to improve upon?

3. Which is best--working with your own students or others?

4. Did you have enough diagnostic information on the Chapter 1 and LEP students?

5. Were you able to identify and address weak areas?

6. Was your instruction more general in nature?

7. What kind of materials, books, etc. do you need to be successful with these "at-risk" youngsters?

8. Do you see ways literacy issues can be addressed?

9. What key parent involvement/education issues would you like addressed as key component of Chapter 1 Program?

APPENDIX B

TEACHER NEEDS SURVEY REGARDING "AT-RISK" STUDENT SERVICES

TEACHER NEEDS SURVEY
REGARDING
"AT-RISK" STUDENT SERVICES

To obtain information to improve Chapter 1 and NEP/LEP services, and in partial completion of my doctorate program, please answer the following questions relating to "AT-RISK" STUDENTS and return to Marilyn Rogers, Resource Specialist, Romoland School:

1. Do you agree that Chapter 1 students are being provided adequate services from **kindergarten through grade 3**?

   _____yes

   _____no

   If yes, please explain how you believe these services are being provided:_____

   _____

2. Do you agree that Chapter 1 students should be provided services beyond grade <u>three</u>, if needed?

   _____yes

   _____no

   If yes, please explain how you believe these services could be provided:_____

   _____

3. Are you, the classroom teacher, satisfied with the services being provided to the non-English proficient (NEP) and limited English proficient (LEP) student(s) in <u>kindergarten through grade three</u>?

   _____yes

   _____no

   If yes, please explain what is your primary satisfaction you see for your student(s) now or in the past?_____

   _____

   If no, what would you like to see improved for these students?

   _____

4. Are you, the classroom teacher, satisfied with the services being provided to the non-English proficient (NEP) and limited English proficient (LEP) student(s) in <u>fourth through sixth</u> grades?

_____yes

_____no

If yes, please explain what is your primary satisfaction you see for your student(s) now or in the past?_____

_____

If no, what would you like to see improved for these students?

_____

5. When you refer an "at-risk" student to the Student Study Team, are you satisfied with the time-line, interventions, services, etc. you are provided by the team?

_____yes

_____no

If yes, please give an example of your satisfaction provided by the Student Study Team:_____

_____

If no, please provide some suggestions of how the SST might improve to assist you more with an "at-risk" student:_____

_____

_____

6. When a student is referred to special education, do you agree or disagree with the time-line, placement, etc. provided by the specialists/IEP Team involved in the referral/IEP process?

_____yes

_____no

If you agree and answered yes, please give an example of a student receiving adequate service:_____

_____

If you disagree and answered no, please give an example of a student receiving inadequate service:_____

_____

7. Have you ever given any consideration to having an "ungraded primary" at this school or K-3 ungraded which provides multi-age/multi-grade students at various developmental/age levels?

_____yes

_____no

If yes, what is your professional opinion about such a plan?

_____

8. Do you think there is adequate early intervention from Head Start, kindergarten through grade 3 for "at-risk" students?

_____yes

_____no

If yes, please give an example of adequate early intervention:

_____

9. Has it been your experience to receive prior information regarding your student(s) from Head Start or other sources of previous assessments or referrals made by previous teachers?

_____yes

_____no

If yes, please give an example of receiving prior information:

_____

If no, what would you like to receive from pre-school/other teachers:_____

10. If you could make any changes in services for students "at-risk", what changes would you recommend to improve services?

_____

_____

Please check teacher grade range: (K-3)_____(4-6)_____
Teacher name (if desired):_____

APPENDIX C

PARENT/STUDENT LETTER

November, 1992

Dear Parent(s) and Student,

The Extended Day classroom teacher has a plan to work together to help you, the student, to improve your language skills. These include oral language--listening and speaking, reading and written language.

By the next parent conference in May of this school year, I would like to meet with you, the parent(s), and you, the student, _____. I would also like to invite you parent(s) to our Home-School Parnership Workshops as we work on this plan for prevention of school failure through early intervention and success experiences for your child.

We can look forward to see if our plan has worked, and you, _____, have improved in listening, speaking, reading and writing in the emergent stage. I would like to assess whether we have made progress. If we assess now and before the next parent conference, we can compare the pre and post assessments. We encourage a teacher-parent-student partnership during this school year and into the summer. Fun activities will be provided for you, parent(s), to work and play with _____ at home. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Marilyn R. Rogers (Mrs.)
Parent Coordinator

I give my permission to assess _____ to determine his/her present level of academic performance in language arts.

_____ _____

Parent/Guardian Signature Date

APPENDIX D

EXTENDED DAY STUDENT SURVEY

EXTENDED DAY STUDENT SURVEY

Dear _____,

Please complete a survey so your teachers will know how you feel about school and what you need extra help in to improve in listening, speaking, reading and writing.

BELOW put an "X" on the face you feel fits your attitude--

HAPPY face	SAD face	STRAIGHT face

1. Do you like to have more than one teacher help you with your reading and writing schoolwork?

2. Do you like to have your mother or father or someone at home to help you with your homework?

3. Do you like to have someone read to you?

4. Do you like to read yourself?

5. Do you like it when a teacher helps you in a small group with your reading or writing?

6. Do you feel there is someone, a teacher or parent or someone older, you can talk to and ask about things you do not understand?

APPENDIX E

EARLY INTERVENTION FOR SCHOOL SUCCESS (EISS) CONTINUUM

This continuum is an adaptation of the EISS Continuum and Progress Report developed in the summer, 1992 at the Trainers' Institute used with permission of:

Dean Hiser, EISS Program Director
Orange County Department of Education
200 Kalmus Drive
Costa Mesa, California 92626

EISS CONTINUUM AND PROGRESS REPORT

PART ONE

Child's Name _____ **Teacher** _____ **Birthdate** _____ **Year** ___ **Grade** ___ **School** _____

Each line represents continuous growth throughout the year. Placement of the numeral on the line indicates your child's progress.

1=Initial Assessment (School Entry) **2=Mid Year Report (Second Quarter)** **3=(Third Quarter)** **4=(Fourth Quarter)**

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Interaction with Other Children

Displays increasing interest in playing with other children | Is beginning to share toys, belongings, and play space | Observes others play or plays independently | Parallel play | Engages in imaginative role playing | Plays best with one other child or in small groups | Plays with others requires teacher/adult intervention

Interaction with Adults

Self-assertive, establishes own independence | Seeks attention and approval from adults | Requires help from adults to be successful in play | Becoming aware of limits | Initiates interaction with adults | Cooperates with adults to set rules

Learning Skills

Rapidly changing focus of attention | Is able to focus attention for short periods | Shows sustained interest in chosen activities | Listens, follows most directions

ORAL LANGUAGE

Listening

Listens when others speak | Listens without interrupting | Distinguishes sounds in the environment | Listens to and follows simple directions | Listens to stories & tapes | Listens for information

Speaking

Speaks in own language and dialect | Responds verbally when spoken to | Uses language to meet basic needs | Asks and answers many questions | Puts facts and understanding in own words

EMERGENT LITERACY

Writing

Explores communication through painting, drawing, and art | Uses drawing for writing and drawing | Can dictate a story to go with a drawing | Differentiates writing from drawing | Scribbles for writing

Reading

Shows interest in books | Chooses favorite books | Points to pictures in books | Holds book upright and turns pages front to back | Asks questions about pictures in books | "Reads" a story using pictures | Understands print holds meaning | Reads own name

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EISS CONTINUUM AND PROGRESS REPORT

PART TWO

Child's Name _____ Teacher _____ Birthdate _____ Year ___ Grade ___ School _____

Each line represents continuous growth throughout the year. Placement of the numeral on the line indicates your child's progress.

1=Initial Assessment (School Entry) 2=Mid Year Report (Second Quarter) 3=(Third Quarter) 4=(Fourth Quarter)

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Interaction with Other Children

Plays best with one other child or in small groups | Plays with others requires teacher/ adult intervention | Interacts with three or more children working cooperatively | Interacts with a variety of children in teacher-structured routine tasks | Engages in dramatic play and imaginative and pretend play with others | Has developed skills of cooperation and problem solving in play

Interaction with Adults

Becoming aware of limits | Initiates interaction with adults | Cooperates with adults to set rules | Cooperates with adults to follow classroom/home rules | Follows most rules independently | Uses rules set in classroom throughout school environment

Learning Skills

Shows sustained interest in chosen activities | Listens, follows most directions | Tries new tasks | Works independently and completes self selected and teacher selected tasks | Uses previous knowledge to solve tasks independently

ORAL LANGUAGE

Listening

Listens to stories and tapes | Listens for information | Listens to and recites nursery rhymes, songs, and chants from memory | Listens to peers for ideas | Recalls facts and main ideas | Comprehends facts & main ideas

Speaking

Uses language to meet basic needs | Asks and answers many questions | Puts facts and understanding in their own words | Carries on a conversation in work and play with peers | Participates in singing, story telling, drama and poetry | Maintains topic of conversation | Shares object or event with class | Explains situations using descriptive language

EMERGENT LITERACY

Writing

Can dictate a story to go with a drawing | Differentiates writing from drawing | Scribbles for writing | Makes letter like forms | Uses learned letters in random fashion for writing | Writes recognizable words | Spaces words apart | Uses invented spelling | Uses phonetics and some conventional spelling

Reading

"Reads" a story using pictures | Understands print holds meaning | Reads own name | Rereads from scribbles, beginning letters or words | Reads signs/logos labels and high interest words | Tracks left to right and top to bottom | "Reads" own composition | Attempts to read memorized or familiar texts | Uses independent strategies (context clues, decoding, etc.) to attack new text

EISS CONTINUUM AND PROGRESS REPORT

PART THREE

Child's Name _____ Teacher _____ Birthdate _____ Year ___ Grade ___ School _____

Each line represents continuous growth throughout the year. Placement of the numeral on the line indicates your child's progress.

1=Initial Assessment (School Entry) 2=Mid Year Report (Second Quarter) 3=(Third Quarter) 4=(Fourth Quarter)

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Interaction with Other Children

Interacts with a variety of children in teacher-structured routine tasks | Engages in dramatic play and imaginative and pretend play with others | Has developed skills of cooperation and problem solving in play | Has developed strategies for approaching others and initiating play successfully | Has developed "give and take" in peer interaction | Uses cooperation to solve problems independently

Interaction with Adults

Cooperates with adults to follow classroom/home rules | Follows most rules independently | Uses rules set in classroom throughout school environment | Knows expectations of responsible behavior | Adjusts behavior and acts appropriately in new or unexpected situations

Learning Skills

Works independently and completes self selected and teacher selected tasks | Uses previous knowledge to solve tasks independently | Maintains attention and persists even if facing difficulties | Considers possible solutions

ORAL LANGUAGE

Listening

Listens to peers for ideas | Recalls facts and main idea | Comprehends facts and main ideas | Reacts appropriately to a speaker | Answers questions

Speaking

Shares object or event with class | Explains situations using descriptive language | Uses descriptive sentences to predict outcomes | Shares ideas effectively with a small group | Shares ideas, tells a story or a poem before a large group | Participates in discussion with a group to solve problems

EMERGENT LITERACY

Writing

Writes recognizable words | Spaces words apart | Uses invented spelling | Uses phonetics and some invented spelling | Writes sentences using sentence frames or models | Writes sentences using word banks class dictionaries or webs | Conventional spelling appears more frequently | Combines related sentences to create paragraphs

Reading

"Reads" own composition | Attempts to read memorized or familiar texts | Recognizes high frequency words | Uses independent strategies (context clues, decoding skills, etc.) to attack new text | Comprehends familiar texts and explores new materials | Reads for enjoyment | Self-corrects through reading strategies

EISS CONTINUUM AND PROGRESS REPORT

PART FOUR

Child's Name _____ Teacher _____ Birthdate _____ Year ___ Grade ___ School _____

Each line represents continuous growth throughout the year. Placement of the numeral on the line indicates your child's progress.

1=Initial Assessment (School Entry) 2=Mid Year Report (Second Quarter) 3=(Third Quarter) 4=(Fourth Quarter)

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Interaction with Other Children

Has developed strategies for approaching others successfully — Has developed "give and take" in peer interaction — Uses cooperation to solve problems independently — Is learning to empathize with others — Explains choices and reasons for interactions — Engages in competitive game play with rules

Interaction with Adults

Adjusts behavior appropriately in new or unexpected situations — Is able to discuss and demonstrate appropriate decision making — Developing a sense of control and responsibility

Learning Skills

Maintains attention and persists even facing difficulties — Considers possible solutions — Asks questions to clarify knowledge — Weighs chances of success or failure — Tries several strategies — Pursues specific interests and follows through on activities

ORAL LANGUAGE

Listening

Reacts appropriately to a speaker — Answers questions — Is expanding speaking and listening vocabulary through discussion — Is extending critical thinking and problem solving ability

Speaking

Shares ideas, tells a story or a poem before a large group — Participates in discussion with a large group to solve a problem — Acts out a story using appropriate language, and gestures — Participates in discussion in order to understand and complete a task — Participates in discussion to extend critical thinking and problem solving ability

EMERGENT LITERACY

Writing

Writes sentences using word banks, class dictionaries, or webs — Conventional spelling appears in writing more frequently — Combines related sentences to make a paragraph — Writes paragraphs Is beginning to use punctuation — Uses capitals and periods independently — Combines related paragraphs to create a story or report — Conventional spelling

Reading

Self-corrects through reading strategies — Reads with expression — Uses extensive sight vocabulary — Reads/interprets a variety of texts — Reads to gather information for a specific project — Reads independently

APPENDIX F

CHAPTER 1 EXTENDED DAY TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE #2

CHAPTER 1 EXTENDED DAY TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE #2

A follow-up Extended Day meeting with teachers of the Chapter 1 and LEP students scheduled for June 16, 1993 at 9:00 a.m. is for completion of this questionnaire. This is the third meeting held during this school year regarding the Chapter I Extended Day Program. The first meeting was held in preparation of this year's program after the Pilot in May, 1992. The second meeting was to determine how long assigned students should attend: a.) whether a semester or full year b.) the procedure for exiting any students who could be replaced by others with greater needs

These questions were asked of the Pilot Program Extended Day teachers at the first pre school year meeting and now post school year meeting again to survey this year's Extended Day Team:

1. What worked well? Please explain your program successes.

2. What do we need to improve upon? Please give details.

3. Which is best--working with your own students or others? Why?

4. Did you have enough diagnostic information on the Chapter I and LEP students? Please be specific regarding information.

5. Were you able to identify and address weak areas? How?

6. Was your instruction more general in nature? Give details.

7. What kind of materials, books, etc. do you need to be more successful with these at-risk youngsters? Please list needs.

8. Do you see ways "family" literacy issues can be addressed?

9. What key parent involvement/education issues would you like as key component of Chapter 1 Program addressed? Please list.